UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/modernlanguageno37johnuoft

206 - 212

BINDING LIST FEB 1 1924

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

VOLUME XXXVII

1922

188381
13.3.24

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

PB
·1
M6
v.37

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Goode, Clement T., Sir Thomas Elyot's *Titus and Gysippus*	1
Nethercot, Arthur H., The Term "Metaphysical Poets" before Johnson	11
Bell, Clair H., The Call of the Blood in the Mediæval German Epic	17
Crane, Ronald S., An Early Eighteenth-Century Enthusiast for Primitive Poetry: John Husbands	27
Austin, H. D., Dante Notes	36
Tolman, A. H., Shakespeare's Manipulation of his Sources in *As You Like It*	65
Snyder, F. B., Notes on Burns and England	76
Zeydel, E. H., The Rimes of Stefan George	82
Cummings, H., Chaucer's *Prologue*, 1-7	86
Merrill, L. R., Vaughan's Influence upon Wordsworth's Poetry	91
Lancaster, H. C., Seventeenth-Century Prosody: "Hier"; "Fléau"; "Meutrier"; "Fuir"	96
Chinard, G., Chateaubriand et l'Abbé C. F. Painchaud	101
Callaway, Morgan, Jr., The Dative of Time How Long in Old English,	129
Nicolson, Marjorie H., More's *Psychozoia*	141
Raven, Anton A., A Study in Masefield's Vocabulary	148
Kern, Alfred A., *King Lear* and *Pelleas and Ettarre*	153
Coad, Oral S., An Old American College Play	157
Crawford, A. W., A Note on *Julius Cæsar*	164
Chinard, G., Chateaubriand et Mrs. Sutton: l'epilogue d'un roman d'amour	193
Gillet, J. E., Cueva's *Comedia del Infamador* and the Don Juan Legend	206
Constans, A., Georges de Scudéry's Lost Epic	212
Collitz, H., Germanische Wortdeutungen	215
Clark, A. M., Thomas Heywood as a Critic	217
Brooke, T., Stanza-Connection in the *Fairy Queen*	223
Babbitt, Irving, Schiller and Romanticism	257
Lovejoy, A. O., Reply to Professor Babbitt	268
Collitz, H., Germanische Wortdeutungen, II	274
Pancoast, H. S., Did Wordsworth jest with Matthew?	279
Gillet, J. E., Church-and-Stage Controversy in Granada	284
Farnham, W., Scogan's *Quem Quaeritis*	289
Silz, Walter, Rational and Emotional Elements in Heinrich von Kleist	321
Schaffer, Aaron, The *Trente-six ballades joyeuses* of Théodore de Banville	328
Knowlton, E. C., Causality in *Samson Agonistes*	333

PAGE

Vogt, G. C., *The Wife of Bath's Tale, Women Pleased,* and *La Fée Urgele:* A Study in the Transformation of Folk-Lore Themes in Drama 339
Bierstadt, A. M., Unacknowledged Poems by Thomas Campbell.... 343
Tamblyn, W. F., Notes on *King Lear* 346
Baum, P. F., The Mare and the Wolf 350
Eddy, W. A., A Source for Gulliver's First Voyage 353
Kluge, Friedrich, Germanisches Reckentum: frz. *garçon* 385
Kurrelmeyer, W., German Lexicography, Part IV 390
Martin, H. M., Termination of Qualifying Words before Feminine Nouns and Adjectives in the Plays of Lope de Vega 398
Judson, A. C., A Forgotten Lovelace Manuscript 407
White, Newman I., Shelley's Debt to Alma Murray 411
Eddy, William A., Rabelais,—A Source for *Gulliver's Travels* 416
Tolman, A. H., The Structure of Shakespeare's Tragedies with special reference to *Coriolanus* 449
Peers, E. A., The Fortunes of Lamartine in Spain 458
Lancaster, H. C., Errors in Beauchamps' *Recherches sur les théâtres de France* 466
Wann, L., Milton's *Lycidas* and the Play of *Barnavelt* 470
Glicksman, H., A Comment on Milton's *History of Britain* 474
Crawford, A. W., Keats's *Ode to the Nightingale* 476

REVIEWS

J. M. Rudwin, The Origin of the German Carnival Comedy. [*Donald C. Stuart.*] 40
Oscar Kuhns and H. W. Church, *Cyrano de Bergerac* par Edmond Rostand; A. G. H. Spiers, Edmond Rostand. *Cyrano de Bergerac.* [*H. Carrington Lancaster.*] 47
J. Murray, *Le château d'Amour* de Robert Grosseteste évêque de Lincoln. [*George L. Hamilton.*] 49
Gustave Cohen, Mystères et Moralités du manuscrit 617 de Chantilly. [*Grace Frank.*] 106
Oliver Elton, A Survey of English Literature, 1780-1880. [*L. N. Broughton.*] 110
Carl Van Doren, The American Novel. [*J. C. French.*] 115
Rudolph Schevill, The Dramatic Art of Lope de Vega, together with *la Dama boba.* Edited. [*E. C. Hills.*] 167
Luigi F. Benedetto, Le origini di *Salammbô.* [*A. Coleman.*] 175
T. Navarro Tomás, Manual de Pronunciación Española. [*M. A. Colton.*] 227
Thomas J. Wise, A Catalogue of the Library of the late John Henry Wrenn. [*J. W. Draper.*] 237

PAGE

C. H. C. Wright, French Classicism. [*H. C. Lancaster.*] 244

Oliver Towles, Prepositional Phrases of Asseveration and Adjuration in Old and Middle French. [*P. B. Fay.*] 292

G. L. van Roosbroeck, The Cid Theme in France in 1600; The Purpose of Corneille's Cid. [*H. C. Lancaster.*] 296

H. G. Gräf, Goethe über seine Dichtungen. [*L. L. Mackall.*] 300

P. R. Lieder, Scott and Scandinavian Literature. [*F. W. J. Heuser.*] 303

Sir Israel Gollancz, *Cleanness*, an Alliterative Tripartite Poem on the Deluge, the Destruction of Sodom, and the Death of Belshazzar, by the Poet of *Pearl*. [*R. J. Menner.*] 355

E. Ermatinger, Das dichterische Kunstwerk. [*T. M. Campbell.*] 362

Neil C. Brooks, The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy with Special Reference to the Liturgic Drama. [*Grace Frank.*] 367

Harry V. Wann, French Conversation and Composition. [*George Getchev.*] 370

R. W. Chambers, *Beowulf*, an Introduction to the Study of the Poem with a Discussion of the Stories of Offa and Finn. [*Howard R. Patch.*] 418

Pierre Guilloux, L'Esprit de Renan;
Lewis F. Mott, Ernest Renan;
Walter Küchler, Ernest Renan, der Dichter und der Künstler. [*James F. Mason.*] 428

Friedrich Bruns, A Book of German Lyrics. [*B. J. Vos.*] 431

Gustave Cohen, Écrivains français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVIIe siècle. [*H. C. Lancaster.*] 434

Harry Mayne, Immermann. Der Mann und sein Werk im Rahmen der Zeit- und Literaturgeschichte;
Herbert Levin, Die Heidelberger Romantik;
Wilhelm Kosch, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im Spiegel der nationalen Entwickelung von 1813-1918;
Matthew G. Bach, Wieland's Attitude toward Woman and her Cultural and Social Relations. [*A. W. Porterfield.*] 482

Geoffroy Atkinson, The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature before 1700; The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature from 1700 to 1720. [*G. Chinard.*] 491

Chauncey B. Tinker, Young Boswell: Chapters on James Boswell, the Biographer, based largely on new material. [*E. D. Snyder.*] .. 498

Robert L. Ramsay, Short Stories of America. [*J. C. French.*] 502

CORRESPONDENCE

PAGE

Shorey, Paul, A Postliminear Corollarium for Coryate 53
Haxo, Henry E., Pierre Bayle and His Biographers 55
Woodbridge, Benj. M., Sylvestre Bonnard and Philetas 56
Van Roosbroeck, Gust. L., An Impromptu of Voltaire Completed 58
Ross, E. C.., A Note on *The Scarlet Letter* 58
Rudmose-Brown, T. B., *La Galerie du Palais* 117
Lancaster, H. C., A Reply 118
Emerson, O. F., Milton's *Comus*, 93-94 118
Smith, C. A., "*Under the sonne he loketh*" 120
Van Roosbroeck, G. L., A Lost Play by Alexandre Hardy: *La Folie de Clidamant* 121
Burlingame, E. W., Etymology of *Burlingame* (*Burlingham*) 123
McKillop, Alan D., A Poem in the Collins Canon 181
Omond, T. S., A Brief Rejoinder 181
Gowen, Herbert H., Jottings 183
Woodbridge, B. M., Flaubert and War-Brides 183
Baudin, Maurice, The Rôle of the Ghost in *Hamlet* 185
Marinoni, A., A Note on Maupassant 186
Burlingame, E. W., St. Cuthbert and the King's Daughter 187
Starnes, D. T., An Erroneous Ascription to Wyatt 188
Cons, L., La Préface des Fables de La Fontaine 246
Kaye, F. B., Seventeenth Century Reference to Shakespeare 248
Van Roosbroeck, G. L., Sylvestre Bonnard and the Fairy 248
Confrey, B., A Note on Richard Crashaw 250
Van Roosbroeck, G. L., Corneille's Relations with Louis Petit 307
Johnston, O. M., Note on *Por ce que*, *Parce que*, and *Pour que* 310
Law, R. A., The Background of Browning's *Love Among the Ruins* .. 312
Starck, T., The Rimes of Stefan George 313
Hughes, Helen S., A Letter to Richardson from Edward Young 314
Beck, Margaret M., The Dance of Death in Shakespeare 372
Rea, John D., *Julius Cæsar* II, i, 10-34 374
Klaeber, Fr., "Looking Under the Sun" 376
Tatlock, J. S. P., "Under the Sonne" 377
Withington, R., A Portmanteau Word of 1761: "Tomax" 377
Shafer, R., Henry More's *Psychozoia* 379
McCutcheon, R. P., Two Eighteenth-Century Emendations to *Chevy Chase* 436
Kuhl, E. P., A Song and a Pun in Shakespeare 437
Rowe, Mary B., Old French *aigre*, "vinegar" 438
Van Roosbroeck, G. L., Verses attributed to Voltaire 440
Hills, E. C., Thomas Jefferson and Molière 443
Potter, G. R., "Sweet, Reluctant, Amorous Delay" among some Eighteenth Century English Poets 443
Hanford, J. H., The Evening Star in Milton 444

PAGE

Baldwin, T. W., On *King Lear* 504
Hammond, Eleanor P., Poems "Signed" by Sir Thomas Wyatt 505

BRIEF MENTION

T. S. Omond, A Study of Metre. [*J. W. Bright.*] 59
Karl Young, The Dramatic Associations of the Easter Sepulchre. [*Grace Frank.*] 62
Alexander C. Judson, *The Captives; or The Lost Recovered.* By Thomas Heywood. [*S. C. Chew.*] 63
Gustave Lanson, Manuel bibliographique de la littérature française moderne. [*E. C. Armstrong.*] 64
F. P. Le Buffe, *The Hound of Heaven:* An Interpretation. [*J. W. Bright.*] 124
T. R. Smith, Anthology of Swinburne's *Poems.* [*S. C. Chew.*] 128
Edward Sapir, Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech. [*J. W. Bright.*] 188
Gustave Stern, 'Swift,' 'Swiftly,' and their Synonyms: A Contribution to Semantic Analysis and Theory. [*J. W. Bright.*] 251
Philological Quarterly. [*J. W. Bright.*] 254
A. M. Freeman, Vanessa and her Correspondence with Jonathan Swift. [*J. W. Tupper.*] 255
Jennie Masters Tabb, Father Tabb, His Life and Work: A Memorial. [*F. A. Litz.*] 255
Robert Bridges, Milton's Prosody. [*J. W. Bright.*] 316
W. P. Ker, Fleurs de France, Poésies lyriques depuis le Romantisme. [*G. Chinard.*] 320
John M. Hill, Index Verborum de Covarruvias Orozco: Tesoro de la Lengua Castellana o Española. [*E. C. Hills.*] 320
Otto Jespersen, Language: its Nature, Development, and Origin. [*J. W. Bright.*] 379
George Sampson, English for the English. [*J. W. Bright.*] 445
Erhard Schiffer, Tassoni in Frankreich. [*R. C. Williams.*] 447
John A. Kelly, England and the Englishman in German Literature of the Eighteenth Century. [*F. Schoenemann.*] 448
J. Middleton Murry, The Problem of Style. [*J. W. Bright.*] 506
G. N. Henning, Hervieu, *La Course du flambeau.* [*E. P. Dargan.*] 511
Paul Kretschmer, Wortgeographie der hochdeutschen Umgangssprache. [*W. Kurrelmeyer.*] 512

Index 513

Recent Publications ..... i-xxxii

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVII JANUARY, 1922 NUMBER 1

SIR THOMAS ELYOT'S *TITUS AND GYSIPPUS*

The opinion that prevails of the source and treatment of Sir Thomas Elyot's story of Titus and Gysippus is not very satisfactory. Apparently it was attended by some misgivings with those who formed it. H. S. Croft says: "The tale which occupies nearly the whole of the present chapter is a translation of one of the stories in the Decameron of Boccaccio (Gior. X, Novel. viii.), and is probably the earliest English version of any of the great poet's writings. It is doubtful, however, whether Sir Thos. Elyot translated directly from the original or (as appears more probable) made use of a Latin version, by the celebrated Philip Beroaldo, whose editions of the classics were in great repute in the sixteenth century. . . . The reader who compares Sir T. Elyot's version either with the Italian of Boccaccio, or with the Latin of Beroaldo, will not fail to remark that our author has diverged widely from both sources."[1] A. C. Lee, referring to the Decameron story, says: "It is also translated or rather paraphrased by Sir Thomas Elyot in his 'The Boke Named the Governour' . . . . It is not quite clear from what version Sir T. Elyot took his, as it differs both from the one in the Decameron and from that of Beroaldo. . . . As the first complete translation of the Decameron into English was not until 1619, this tale is interesting as being one of the first renderings into English of any of the tales."[2] The recent editors

[1] "*The Boke Named the Governour*, devised by Sir Thomas Elyot, Knight," 1531. The authoritative edition is by Henry Herbert Stephen Croft, two volumes, 1883. The story of Titus and Gysippus, "wherein is the ymage of perfecte amitie," is in Book II, chapter XII. The editor gives an excellent reprint of the Latin version of the story.

[2] *The Decameron, Its Sources and Analogues*, p. 338.

of Lyly's *Euphues* say: "In Elyot's *Governour* . . . the story of Titus and Gysippus, transl. from Boccaccio, forms ch. xii. of the same book."[3] And Mary Augusta Scott repeats Mr. Croft by saying: "It is uncertain whether Sir Thomas Elyot translated directly from Boccaccio, or, as is more likely, made use of a Latin version, by the celebrated Philip Beroaldo, whose editions of the classics were in great repute in the sixteenth century."[4]

The theme on which the story is built is the popular medieval ideal, both chivalric and humanistic, of the 'sworn brotherhood' or steadfast friendship between two men. It is wrought into story form by having the two men, thus devoted to each other, subjected to the supreme test of rivalry in love. In this character it has some great associations in the course of its history. It is the slight plot of Lyly's *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit,* and it constitutes the thin narrative thread of Shakespeare's *Sonnets.* In modern literature it has received treatment in Goethe's early novel, *Werthers Leiden,* and in Tennyson's fine sea poem, *Enoch Arden.*

The story as used by Elyot consists of two parts. The second part comprises the return sacrifice by the friend, so far as it is allowed to develop, in offering himself instead for the death penalty incurred by his former benefactor and companion. In this way the material is related to the well-known motif of Damon and Pythias, and endless ramifications are involved. Even in its two part character the story is found many times in medieval literature.[5]

Two men in good circumstances, from different countries, are thrown together in the same pursuits, and by a congeniality of tastes become the closest friends. One is betrothed to a lady of gentle birth and breeding. The other incidentally meets the lady and falls deeply in love with her. He repines and falls ill, is questioned by his friend, and confesses his ailment. Instantly the friend yields all claims to the lady's hand, and urges and aids her union with the other. After the marriage the couple repair to the husband's native city. Sometime later the generous friend loses his property and is driven into exile. He wanders to the

[3] M. W. Croll and Harry Clemons, *Euphues*, p. 30, footnote 2.

[4] *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian*, p. 226-7.

[5] Both Mr. Lee, *supra*, and Dr. Landau, *Die Quellen des Dekameron*, give a long list of analogues.

home of his former bosom friend in the distant city. In his disappointment at not being recognized and relieved, he withdraws to a deserted place nearby to spend the night. A murder is committed hard by, and he is charged with it. To end his miserable existence he confesses to the crime and is led to judgment. In the course of the trial his now prosperous and powerful friend recognizes him and inculpates himself with the crime to save the wretched man from the impending fate. The real murderer in the crowd becomes remorseful at the remonstrances between the two friends, and gives himself up. In the good will that follows the criminal is pardoned, the friends are reunited, and happiness for all ensues.

There can be little doubt that Elyot knew the Boccaccio story or the Beroaldo translation of it, more probably the latter from his humanistic tastes and preferences. The identity of names, certain coincidences of particular elements, and a general resemblance in form and mechanical outline, indicate as much quite conclusively. But to say that the Elyot version is a translation or even a paraphrase of either Boccaccio or Beroaldo is to assume more than is warranted from the facts in hand. Beroaldo is a translation, as nearly literal as well can be, of Boccaccio. But analysis will show that Elyot's account differs from the others in several very vital particulars, more indeed than one is content to ascribe wholly to Elyot's inventive talent in reconstructing the story.

(1) The time is not specifically that of Octavius Caesar. (2) The number of characters is reduced, and names are modified or omitted. (3) The fathers of the young men are not friends or acquainted with each other. Titus's father is a Roman senator, not simply a gentleman in Rome. (4) The close physical resemblance of the two friends is added and emphasized. (5) The friends are associated almost from childhood—eight years instead of three. (6) Gysippus's wooing of Sophronia is carried on secretly from Titus. (7) Titus does not debate with himself whether or not to indulge his love, but deals only in reproaches of himself and his fate. (8) He does not dissemble his passion on being questioned by Gysippus, but confesses freely and contritely. (9) Gysippus is not hesitant in his decision after Titus's confession, or half-hearted in the sacrifice he elects to make for the sake of their friendship. (10) There is no long courtly debate between the two. (11) Gysippus does not say or feel that he can

easily convert his love to another, or offer his plan late, and as a mere subterfuge, but gives it at once whole-heartedly in full realization of the cost it means to him. (12) There is a complete recognition by the two friends of a high-ordained fate in Titus's love. (13) Titus's father is dead before the marriage, not dies after. (14) Sophronia is not given an explanation of the great imposture put upon her. According to a much older order, having no rights above mere chattel she may but acquiesce in the high control of love which Titus and Gysippus have recognized and honored. (15) Public avowal of the manner of the marriage is made on the day following by Gysippus's wise provision, not compelled by the scandal arising from delay and by Titus's urgent recall to Rome. (16) The assembly is not held in a temple by Titus's cunning or made up of the dissatisfied kindred only, but is summoned by Gysippus at his own house and comprises "all the nobilitie of the citie." (17) Titus's speech is not specious, arrogant, or derogatory of the character of the Greeks, but is straightforward, full of high reasoning, and honorable to the Greeks: it is not an intimidation but an elucidation, with a new line of argument altogether.

The second part shows greater divergencies still. (1) There is a long lapse of time, enough that "many fayre children" are born to Titus and Sophronia, and Titus is raised to many dignities and honors in Rome. (2) Persons and names are omitted, titles and offices are different, and institutions are changed. (3) Titus and Sophronia issue out their Roman mansion, not Titus alone passes by, when Gysippus is encountered. (4) Gysippus's swooning, and recovery by bystanders, from his disappointment is added. (5) He takes refuge in an old barn outside the city, not in a deserted cave within the city. (6) He is not merely disconsolate and falls asleep, but meditates suicide, lifts his knife against himself, but is prevented from carrying out his purpose by his philosophy. (7) The murder is not committed in his place of refuge before his eyes, but outside while he is asleep. (8) The murderer comes into the barn, discovers the sleeper, recognizes his desperate state, befouls his knife with blood, and departs without awaking him. (9) Gysippus does not confess the murder when aroused by the searcher and when charged with it, but merely rejoices and denies nothing. (10) He is not carried before Marcus Varro, Praetor, Titus happening in by chance, but is taken at once to the senate,

where Titus is sitting as "Consull or in other lyke dignitie." (11) He is not condemned to crucifixion and led away before Titus confesses: no sentence is passed when the real criminal appears and gives himself up. (12) The case is not finally referred to Caesar from the pretorium, but is settled in the senate. (13) In Boccaccio and Beroaldo Gysippus is received joyously by Titus and Sophronia, shares their goods, is given Titus's sister Fulvia to wife, and the four remain in Rome under one roof completely happy. In Elyot Gysippus is as gladly received, is offered abundance, but returns home accompanied by Titus with a large army which does "sharpe execution" on his enemies in Athens, his goods are restored, and he is left in "perpetuall quietenes" unmarried.

In a larger consideration of the entire story. (1) Phrasal similarities are lacking. (2) Proportion in like elements in the two versions is not maintained. (3) The argument is new, and the form in which it is cast is different. And most notable of all, (4) the spirit and purpose are radically dissimilar. The older story, notwithstanding its formal profession, purposes to extol love. Elyot, on the other hand, adjusts his treatment to his theme of "perfecte amitie," and exemplifies and exalts friendship. The difference is substantially that of two adverse types of writers, the courtly romancer and the moralizing humanist. Obviously the idea that Sir Thomas Elyot's story is a "translation" or even a "paraphrase" of Boccaccio's or Beroaldo's must be abandoned.

The recognized source in western literatures of the story in full form is the *Disciplina Clericalis* of Petrus Alphonsus(-i), a learned Spanish Jew who was converted to Christianity in 1106. Petrus's work is derived confessedly from the Arabic, in part at least,[6] and in translation and adaptation was popular throughout the middle ages.[7] The story (II in the collection) is much briefer than Elyot's or Boccaccio's, but it is unmistakably the same story.[8]

[6] "Propterea ergo libellum compegi, partim ex prouerbiis philosophorum et suis castigacionibus, partim ex prouerbiis et castigacionibus arabicis et fabulis et uersibus, partim ex animalium et uolucrum similitudinibus."—Prologus.

[7] "*Disciplina Clericalis* ist der hergebrachte Name der ersten occidentalischen Sammlung morgenländischer Geschichten und Sprüche, bekanntlich das älteste Novellenbuch des Mittelalters."—A. Hilka und W. Söderhjelm, *Die Disciplina*, u. s. w., Vorwort.

[8] Dr. Marcus Landau, *supra*, thinks the story in the *Disciplina Clericalis*

Two merchants, one of Egypt the other of Bagdad, become friends through business dealings. In the course of their transactions the Bagdadian comes to Egypt, is received hospitably by the Egyptian and entertained for eight days. At the end of this time he falls sick, and is discovered by his anxious host to be in love. The good host generously enquires if there is a damsel in the household whom he affects. All are made to pass in review before him—singers, dancers, daughters—but none please him. There remains only a certain noble maiden in the house, whom the merchant has long been educating for his own wife. She is without hesitation presented, and the sick man declares: "*Ex hac est michi mors et in hac est michi uita!*" Thereupon the unselfish master surrenders her to the friend, settles a marriage portion upon her, effects the union of the two, and allows them to depart for the husband's native city. In time the Egyptian falls into misfortune and is driven into exile. He wanders to the city and home of his friend, but in shame at his wretched condition withdraws to an old shrine nearby for the night. For a long time he meditates anxiously his sad plight. A murder is committed outside. The body is found. Searchers enter the shrine, find the Egyptian, and have his confession that he did the deed. He is tried and condemned to death. By chance his friend is in the crowd, recognizes him, and to save him from the impending fate confesses to the murder himself. The real felon, present in the concourse, is struck by the devotion of the two friends, and comes forward and confesses. The Bagdadian honors his recovered friend, shares his goods with him, and offers him a home for life. But the Egyptian, with the favor of fortune upon him once more, returns to his native land.

Some features of the Petrus story persuade one to believe that Elyot knew it as well. (1) The eight days' entertainment becomes eight years in Elyot, as compared with three years in Boccaccio and Beroaldo. (2) The noble damsel is in no way considered in the transfer of lovers and the marriage. (3) The old shrine is more nearly the "olde barne" than the cave. (4) The suicidal intention *previous* to the murder is easily inferable. (3) The murder takes place *apart* from the poor wretch's asylum and *without* his

was not Boccaccio's only source. S. L. Wolff, *Modern Philology*, April, 1910, has promised a study showing additional sources.

knowledge. (6) The searchers merely find the man under suspicious circumstances, and have his confession of the crime. (7) After the reunion the Egyptian is happily repatriated and restored to affluence.

But the greatest likeness of all between Elyot's account and the original is (8) the manifest purpose for which the story is told. In Petrus the story is purely an exemplum, "de integro amico." The Egyptian has long been rearing the noble damsel for his own wife. But just as she becomes marriageable, he gives her up without a murmur to his friend. The sacrifice to friendship is genuine, as great as he could make. He remains unmated for good and all. In the same way, Elyot's Gysippus loves Sophronia, "as moche as any wise man mought possible," but he makes the supreme sacrifice of giving her to his friend willingly and cheerfully, fully aware of the cost to him in public character [9] and private happiness. He never ventures his love again. In Boccaccio and Beroaldo, on the other hand, the purpose to exemplify friendship is only superficial. Love is the dominating interest. Gysippus confesses he can readily change his love to another.[10] He is declared not only not to love Sophronia but scarcely to know her.[11] His giving her up then is no sacrifice or trial, but only a favor conferred in the interest of friendship, with little thought or heed of the consequences.[12] Accordingly the story progresses to a very different ending. He is rewarded with a real love and enjoys the highest conjugal felicity. In brief summary, Sir Thomas Elyot found the

[9] "I knowe well that, ye hauinge your purpose, I shall be in obloqui and derision of all men, and so hated of all my kynrede, that they shall seke occasion to expulse me out of this citie, thinkyng me to be a notable reproche to al my familie."

[10] "Et io il mio amore leggiermente ad un' altra volgendo, avrò te e me contentato," and, "Et ego amorem meum non sanè difficulter in alteram transferens et tibi et mihi satisfecero."

[11] "Il vostro ad un giovane, il quale, non solamente non l'amava, ma appena la cognosceva," and, "Vos juveni Sophroniam despondistis illam non solum non amanti sed paene fastidienti."

[12] "Poi a luogo et a tempo manifesteremo il fatto; il quale, se lor piacerà, bene starà; se non piacerà, sarà pur fatto, e non potendo indietro tornare, converrà per forza che sien contenti," and, "Et cum id quod factum est fieri infectum non possit, necessum erit ut illi, velint nolint, rem ipsam approbare cogantur."

story in Petrus Alphonsus(-i) an exemplum, whence it had widely departed in Boccaccio and Beroaldo, and restored it to its original character.

Elyot's divergencies from the Italian or fifteenth century Latin account may have been of his own invention. But the gain in artistic value or moral effect from the changes is not always apparent. An additional source is probable, and the original story of Petrus is sufficient to supply it. Furthermore, none of the versions that have been pointed out, between the *Disciplina* and the appearance of the *Governour,*[13] are so satisfying as possible sources as the original. None show the distinguishing marks of the Elyot story. Those that bear striking resemblances in distinctive elements come after Elyot, and hence are to be regarded rather as derivatives of his work.[14]

Elyot certainly must have been aware of the existence of the *Disciplina.* Chaucer knew it, and apparently used it first-hand,[15] and the story in the *Gesta Romanorum* was confessedly taken from it. Elyot cannot have been ignorant of such as these. And humanist as he was, would he have been content, being aware of the original, not to know it first-hand, or to take his material indirectly through a vulgar tongue? Moreover, the character of the work, the instruction of a father to a son,—Chaucer quoted it for its moral import—was such as would have stimulated him to know it in the preparation of a work like the *Governour.*

There is a lack of information on Elyot's life, but it seems that he was not abroad until immediately after the publication of the *Governour.* In fact, it was the recognition of his book and the influence of the Queen, which sent him to the continent on a diplomatic mission the following year. But the *Disciplina* was almost certainly easily accessible to him in England. It was enormously popular in Europe from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. As many as sixty manuscripts of it have been preserved,[16] a fourth of which number are found in England. Furthermore, there is con-

[13] *Le Chastoiment d'un père à son fils, Athis et Profilias, Gesta Romanorum, Alphabet of Tales,* Lydgate, Cantimpre, etc.; the list is long.

[14] The versions of Edward Lewicke, M. Montanus, the poet of the Percy Folio Manuscript, and the like.

[15] In the *Tale of Melibeus* Chaucer quotes from the *Disciplina* not fewer than five times.

[16] See A. Hilka and W. Söderhjelm, *Die Disciplina,* u. s. w., Einleitung.

clusive evidence of its popularity on the island, in the fifteenth-century translation of thirty stories of its total content, in the Worcester Cathedral manuscript, recently discovered by Professor W. H. Hulme.[17] Indeed there is no difficulty in the way of Sir Thomas Elyot's knowing the works of the learned Petrus.

Mr. S. L. Wollf, in working out his theory that the plot of *Euphues: the Anatomy of Wit* was derived from the story of Titus and Gysippus in Boccaccio,[18] says, "I find no evidence that Lyly drew from either of them," that is, Elyot or Beroaldo. Indeed there is strong probability that Lyly constructed his narrative, if so slight a framework may be so called, from the Titus and Gysippus material, and Mr. Wollf in pointing out the fact is to be credited with having directed attention to an important matter in literary history. But while Lyly's structural obligations to Boccaccio were perhaps very direct and specific, there does not appear to be any very clear reason for the assumption that he took his plan solely from the Italian. It is more probable that his source was a double one, as was Elyot's apparently, and that he used both Boccaccio—or Beroaldo, or both—and Elyot.

Mr. Wollf's evidence deduced from specific passages purporting to show in Lyly phrasal resemblances to Boccaccio is not very conclusive. Lyly covers his tracks too well, his stylistic qualities are too emphatically derived elsewhere, for much profit from a study of the kind. An appeal to the larger argument, in my judgment, would strengthen the case greatly.

Twice Lyly refers to the story of Titus and Gysippus, the second time in a way that indicates the interpretation he is making of the relationship of the two men. The distinction in the separate rôles was not always understood by the medieval writer, as Lyly understood and indicated it. Sir Thomas Elyot had preserved the old notion of the exemplum by keeping intact the theme of the incorruptible friendship. Conjugal happiness rightly resulted from it for the one youth and the "peace of a quiet mind" for the other. Each esteemed friendship first. Gysippus sacrificed everything to it, and Titus requited as fully as the occasion de-

[17] See *Modern Philology*, 1906, vol. IV, p. 67; *Modern Language Notes*, 1909, vol. XXIV, p. 218; and *Western Reserve University Bulletin*, vol. XXII.

[18] *Modern Philology*, 1910, VII, p. 577.

manded, although simple gratitude and honor would have required as much. On the contrary, Boccaccio, repeated in Beroaldo, had treated the story, on a somewhat lower ethical plane, mainly for the love interest, by never really allowing love and friendship to clash, and had rewarded the friends jointly, whose ties had not been severed, by granting them marital joys alike in the end.

Lyly apparently took his cue from the Italian, or the Latin of Beroaldo, as indicated in his declaration, "Titus must lust after Sempronia, Gysippus must leave her," but being a good humanist at the time, as became his birth, training, and identification with the house of Burleigh, he decided to treat the old well-known relationship of the two men in a way to exemplify with Elyot the friendship thesis but to do so by showing the disasters that follow when friendship is sacrificed to love. In brief, he deliberately planned to maintain the same moral idea as Elyot but to develop his action by having the crucial decisions made in accordance with the dictates of love not friendship. His figures accordingly adopt and follow opposite courses from Elyot's. Gysippus, who is preëminently the impersonation of unselfishness, the real "*integer amicus,*" becomes Philautus or self-love. Euphues, who plays the part of Titus, is endowed with the well-recognized 'happy gift of nature' associated with the word: in fact, the natural impulses predominate in him to the complete loss of all moral and ethical considerations. Neither man, for his character and conduct in the ordeal of love, can be rewarded with domestic happiness.

Lyly extends his use to the particular elements. The parts of his plan, as well, he often develops from some hint or generalization to his purpose among the details in Boccaccio and Beroaldo. When Titus is approached in his sickness by Gysippus, he offers many excuses or evasions, none of which are given specifically, in order to postpone as long as possible the disclosure of his unfortunate love for Sophronia. From the suggestion Lyly develops Euphues's open "falsehood in fellowship" and "fraud in friendship" of protesting love for Livia, one of the gentlewomen in the household of Don Ferardo, when in reality he is consumed with passion for Lucilla. From Gysippus's generous assurance to Titus that he, Titus, is a worthier judge of Sophronia's perfections than himself, Lyly portrays in Euphues a vain superiority over Philautus as a discriminator of feminine beauty and excellence, from

which advantage he arrogates to himself the fair object of their rivalry. Again, in the famous oration to the kindred Titus declares that if any injury has been done in the marriage, Sophronia is to blame for not demanding of him who and what he was. From this declaration, in order to satisfy the demands of the later public, Lyly develops Lucilla's responsibility in the erotic scheme, which holds in defiance all the laws of amity. With surprising fickleness of character, she as speedily rejects Euphues as she has forsaken Philautus, and fixes her choice on a third, without reason even to herself and in contempt of all, and rapidly sinks into unnatural degradation,—all for the sake of maintaining the didactic plan.

Lyly's treatment makes the second part of the story, the requital of the sacrifice to friendship, impossible, inasmuch as there has been no approach to anything of the kind. So when the three years are over—Lyly's first care is not for his story anyway—Euphues must return home alone, Philautus can remain in his native city and pursue his self-centred career, without either the trials or reward of a noble life, Lucilla must be recoverable to neither, and the story as such is ended.

The plausibility of Lyly's having adopted his larger idea in the *Euphues* from Sir Thomas Elyot's treatment of the old material of the two friends is further increased by a reminder of the manifest continuity of humanism in England through the great leaders, from More through Ascham and Elyot to Lyly.

Clement Tyson Goode.

Sweet Briar College.

THE TERM "METAPHYSICAL POETS" BEFORE JOHNSON

Mixed with the flood of very wide-spread disapproval which followed Dr. Samuel Johnson's application (in his *Life of Cowley,* 1779) of the term "metaphysical" to a rather haphazardly chosen group of poets,[1] and with the various attempts to determine just

[1] For such adverse opinions, see G. B. Hill, "Cowley," in his edition of Johnson's *Lives* (Oxford, 1905), I, 68, who quotes Wordsworth: ". . . whom Johnson has strangely styled metaphysical poets"; Southey: "The designation is not fortunate"; etc. The *Quarterly Review* for Oct., 1814,

what he meant by the word, are also to be found several brief endeavors to discover his source.[2] Practically all writers on the subject, however, have been satisfied with mentioning Spence's *Anecdotes* or Dryden's "Original and Progress of Satire," and then dismissing the matter. Courthope, for instance,[3] asserts dogmatically that "Johnson, who is generally credited with the invention of this name, borrowed it from Pope. He had seen the MS. of Spence's 'Anecdotes,'" etc. Hill states that "Johnson may have borrowed the word from Dryden"; quotes the passage; and then goes on to say, "If we could be sure that Johnson had seen Spence's *Anecdotes* before he finished the *Life of Cowley* (in July, 1778, *John. Letters,* ii, 68), he might have borrowed the word from Spence. . . ." This difference of opinion is perhaps based on S. W. Singer's statement in his edition of Spence that "when Dr. Johnson was engaged to write the Lives of the Poets, application was made to the Duke of Newcastle, by Sir Lucas Pepys, for the loan of his manuscript, and it was conceded to his use in the most liberal manner."[4]

But, whatever the date on which the manuscript of Spence came into Johnson's possession, was it necessary for him to have been acquainted with it, or even—the case is purely hypothetical—to have known Dryden's phrase? It is the purpose of this note to show that it was not; that, in other words, the use of the term "metaphysical" in connection with certain poets or with certain types and styles of poetry was far from uncommon in the seven-

vol. XII, p. 80, has—"as they have improperly been called." More recently, J. M. Berdan in his "Introduction" to the *Poems of Cleveland* (New York, 1903), p. 10, speaks of the poets whom Johnson "so unhappily" called "metaphysical." Others, such as Dowden, in *New Studies in Literature* (London, 1902), p. 92, and Schelling, in *English Literature during the Lifetime of Shakespeare* (New York, 1910), p. 367, deny the existence of any "metaphysical school" at all.

[2] The most important of these are Hill's, *op. cit.*, I, 68; F. E. Schelling's, in his "Introduction" to *A Book of Seventeenth Century Lyrics* (Boston, 1899), pp. xxiv-vii; H. J. C. Grierson's, in his "Commentary" on the *Poems of John Donne* (Oxford, 1912), II, 1; and W. J. Courthope's, in his "Life of Pope," *Works of Pope* (London, 1889), v, 51.

[3] For quotations from Courthope and Hill, see preceding note.

[4] "Preface," Spence's *Anec.* (London, 1820), p. xi. This was the first appearance of the *Anecdotes* in print.

teenth and eighteenth centuries, and that therefore there were various sources from which Johnson might have got the suggestion for his phrase, altho probably the responsibility was mainly Dryden's.

The earliest writer known to have used the term with a poetical application was the Italian poet Testi (1593-1646), who, with Marino especially in mind, defended his preference of classical to Italian models thus:

> . . . poichè lasciando quei concetti metaphysici ed ideali di cui sono piene le poesie italiane, mi sono provato di spiegare cose più domestiche. . . .[5]

The passage in Dryden containing the idea is almost too well-known to be quoted, and yet perhaps may be given for the sake of completeness. In 1693, Dryden, speaking of John Donne, said that the latter

> affects the metaphysics, . . . and perplexes the minds of the fair sex with nice speculations of philosophy, when he should engage their hearts.[6]

Leonard Welsted, in 1724, made a chance reference to metaphysics in connection with Cowley, undoubtedly the best-known member of the so-called "Metaphysical School":

> With respect to Metaphysical Knowledge, no Body, I am perswaded, will contend much for the Usefulness of it: Mr. *Cowley*, I think, has said, that he never could determine certainly, whether there was any Truth or no in that Science; but he was either too hasty in this Judgment, or he had not entered into the finest

[5] Quoted by Grierson, *Donne*, II, 1.

[6] Dryden, "Orig. and Prog. of Sat.", *Essays* (ed. Ker, Oxford, 1900), II, 19. Within a single year, Sir Thomas Pope Blount, in his "Donne," *De Re Poetica* (London, 1694), pp. 67-9, had quoted the passage. An interesting predecessor to the idea in Dryden's passage, tho not to the words, appeared in [Richard Graham, Viscount Preston], *Angliae Speculum Morale* (London, 1669), pp. 68-70: Many present poets "strive to bring wit . . . under logical Notions; arguing syllogistically and troubling the world with volumes of what is impertinent to it; that they may advance their own names, so turning our delight into trouble. 'Tis a pity that men of these abilities should not ennoble some of those great subjects which our Nation yieldeth: but should spend their time praising an Eye, or Feature, which they may see exceeded at any Countrey Wake." We have become effeminate, "we spin amongst the Women."

Parts of it; but however that may be, let us add to it Natural Philosophy, and what do they both together serve for, further than Curiosity and Amusement? [7]

Certainly the most interesting, if not the most important, uses of the word with due credit to Dryden, are to be found in John Oldmixon's *Arts of Logick and Rhetorick* (1728), a liberal translation (almost a paraphrase, in fact, with most of the illustrations from English authors) of *La manière de bien penser dans les ouvrages d'esprit* (1687), by Father Dominique Bouhours, a French divine and critic whose opinions were respected in England perhaps next to those of Boileau himself. Speaking of "the false Brillant [*sic*] of Thoughts," Oldmixon wrote:

Thus it was that Dr. *Donne* and Mr. *Cowley,* confounded Metaphysicks and Love, and turn'd Wit into Point. . . .
The noble Critick [Lord Lansdowne, in his "Unnatural Flights in Poetry"; Lansdowne uses no names, however] plainly alludes to the punning Sermons in the Reign of King *James* I. and the Metaphysical Love-Verses by which *Donne* and *Cowley* acquir'd so much Fame.[8]

And again, in a fairly extended passage on Sprat, Cowley, Donne, and Felton:

Dryden tells us, in his Preface to *Juvenal,* that *Cowley* copy'd Dr. *Donne* to a Fault in his Metaphysicks, which his love Verses abound with. . . .[9]

There is apparently no basis for these statements in Bouhours himself.

In 1729, Elijah Fenton, in his *Observations on Some of Mr. Waller's Poems,* brought together both Donne and Cowley in a paragraph which was clearly based on Dryden:

The latter Stanza of these verses [in Waller's song beginning "Stay, Phoebus, stay!"] alludes to the *Copernican* system. . . . Dr. *Donne* and Mr. *Cowley* industriously affected to entertain the

[7] "Dissertation concerning the Perfection of the English Language, the State of Poetry, etc.", in Durham, *Critical Essays of the XVIIIth Century* (New Haven, 1915), p. 381. Durham has failed to discover that this is merely a reference to a passage in Cowley's essay, "Of Agriculture."

[8] Oldmixon, "Dedication," *Arts of Log. and Rhet.* (London, 1728), pp. vi-viii.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 309.

fair sex with such philosophical allusions; which in his riper age Mr. *Waller* as industriously avoided.[10]

Chronologically, Pope was probably the next important link in the historical chain. According to Spence, somewhere about 1734-6 Pope was responsible for these remarks:

Davenant . . . is a scholar of Donne's, and he took his sententiousness and metaphysics from him.—P. . . .
Cowley is a fine poet, in spite of all his faults.—He, as well as Davenant, borrowed his metaphysical style from Donne.—Sprat a worse Cowley.—P.[11]

These seem to have been Pope's only contributions to the series. However, when Warburton brought out his edition of Pope in 1751, he used the word "metaphysical" in discussing the "Rape of the Lock," applying it to the machinery of an epic:

As the *civil* part is intentionally debased by the choice of an insignificant action, so should the *metaphysical* by the use of some very extravagant system.[12]

In the course of one of his *Letters to His Son,* dated Feb. 8, O. S., 1750, Lord Chesterfield came to one of his frequent discussions of Italian poetry. He approved of Tasso and Ariosto, but cared little for Dante, Petrarch, and others.

The *Pastor Fido* of Guarini is so celebrated, that you should read it; but in reading it, you will judge of the great propriety of the characters. A parcel of shepherds and shepherdesses, with True Pastoral Simplicity, talk metaphysics, epigrams, *concetti,* and quibbles, by the hour to each other.

He concluded, as he had done before, by recommending Bouhours to his son.[13]

Another remark of similar tendency was made by Joseph Warton in his *Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope* (1756), a remark which very possibly was indebted to Spence's *Anecdotes,* since Warton made use of them, in manuscript, in his biography:

[10] See *The Works of Edmund Waller, Esq., in Verse and Prose.* Published by Mr. Fenton (London, 1730), p. lxi.
[11] *Anec.,* pp. 170, 173.
[12] Warburton's *Pope* (London, 1757), I, 169; this passage is referred to by Hill in his discussion, *loc. cit.*
[13] *Letters* (N. Y., 1917), I, 293-5.

And indeed to speak the truth, there appears to be little valuable in Petrarch, except the purity of his diction. His sentiments even of love, are metaphysical and far fetched. . . .[14]

The words of the same critic, too, in his own edition of Pope in 1797 may help to clear up the genealogy of Johnson's primary source:

It were to be wished that all the critical opinions of Dr. Johnson were as solid and judicious as are his admirable observations, in the Life of Cowley, on mixt Metaphors, false Wit, and what (after Dryden) he calls "Metaphysical Poetry."[15]

Likewise, in an anonymous *Dialogue on Taste,* written before 1762, occurred a rather elaborate discussion of the progress of taste from the Middle Ages to the middle of the eighteenth century. In this discussion is found a treatment of the metaphysical wit of the Middle Ages, of the bad effect of the imitation of Dante, Ariosto, and Petrarch in England, of the "strained conceits" of Sidney, and of the retardation of poetry by metaphysics. The most important part of the passage follows:

At last the Revolution [of 1688] . . . Metaphysics, now no longer necessary in support of opinions which were now no longer useful in the acquisition of power and riches, sunk by degrees into contempt; and Nature having at last shewn her true and beautiful face, poetry, from acting the part of a magic lanthorn teeming with monsters and chimeras, resumed her genuine province, like the camera obscura, of reflecting the things that are.[16]

At least one other reference occurred before the appearance of

[14] Warton, *Essay on . . . Pope* (London, 1756), p. 66. It is therefore very probable that Thomas Warton, in the third volume of his *History of English Poetry,* 1781 (the first volume appeared in 1774, altho apparently written by 1769), was echoing his brother rather than Johnson when he wrote (London, 1840: Sec. XXXVII, III, 30): "In the sonnets of Surrey, we are surprised to find nothing of that metaphysical cast which marks the Italian poets . . . , especially Petrarch. . . ." Moreover, T. Warton's sentiments, rather than Johnson's, were reflected before 1787 by Vicesimus Knox, in his *Essays, Moral and Literary* (London, 1787), II, 348, 351. J. Warton himself in the second volume of his *Essay,* 1782 (London, 1806, p. 349), stated that "*Dryden* was the first who called him [Donne] a *metaphysical* poet."

[15] Warton, *Works of Alexander Pope,* VI, 235 n.

[16] *A Dialogue on Taste. . . .* The Second Edition. London: . . . MDCCLXII, p. 66.

Johnson's "Life." This was in George Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric,* published in 1776, which contained the following illustration under the section "Want of meaning—the learned":

> Of the same kind of school-metaphysics are these lines of Cowley:
>
> Nothing is there to *come,* and nothing *past,*
> But an eternal *now* does always last.
>
> What an unsatiable appetite has this bastard philosophy for absurdity and contradiction![17]

The field, then, it will be admitted, had been pretty well prepared when, in 1778, Dr. Johnson set his pen to paper and wrote his famous sentence:

> About the beginning of the seventeenth century appeared a race of writers that may be termed the metaphysical poets.

ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT.

The University of Chicago.

THE CALL OF THE BLOOD IN THE MEDIÆVAL GERMAN EPIC

Literature, as we are well aware, is determined by social forces, and clearly reflects the civilization of its own and preceding times. One of the greatest differences between modern literature and that of mediæval times is the difference in the emphasis which is placed upon blood-relationship. While the literature of to-day deals with the individual, the mediæval German epic deals with the closely connected kin group. Every page of this early literature breathes a tale of the importance of blood-relationship, and in the course of its narrative the typical epic presents a family genealogy of astonishing extent and complexity. In so doing, the epic faithfully reflects the social organization of the mediæval world, in which man, as an individual, scarcely existed. On the one hand there is a complete absence of individual liberty in mediæval society, offset on the other by a remarkable community of interest and purpose. Individuality in those days was submerged in the *Sippe,* the larger kin group. The tie of blood,

[17] Campbell, *Phil. of Rhet.* (London, 1776), II, 81-2.

of so slight importance to us, involved the question of life and death itself. Organized on the principle of one for all and all for one, all the members of the kindred answered for the misdeeds of a single member, for they were regarded as almost equally guilty; or they all joined in the defence or avenging of a single member against the agressions of others. Thus it is that the various members of the kin group were regarded much as we regard the members of a single living body.

A picturesque phase of this emphasis upon kin is the belief in the potency of the blood to reveal itself; that even those who, upon meeting, are entirely unconscious of any tie of kinship are inevitably and irresistibly drawn together by the cry of the common blood. The German epics return repeatedly to this theme. Thus, in *Biterolf und Dietleib,* the hearts of father and son respond to their unknown relationship. Dietleib has set out to search for his father who had left home when the son was but two years old. They meet, unknown to each other, at Etzel's court.

Sin vater saz ouch da zehant.
der knabe was im unbekant,
ouch erkande er sines vater niht.
swa ieman sippefriunt siht,
wart ers mit künde niht gewar,
in treit iedoch das herze dar. (3319 ff.)

A later reference is made to this relationship:

daz sich Bitrolf und sin suon
nie mohten kunt getuon,
ez enhaete ir herze daz geseit
den küenen recken vil gemeit
dazs einander solden wesen holt.
swie siz niht haeten versolt,
si wehselten doch dicke
vil güetliche blicke. (4077 ff.)

In Gottfried's *Tristan* neither Marke nor his sister's son, Tristan, knows at their meeting who the other is, but a tropesis of the blood draws them irresistibly to each other:

nu Tristan den künec sehen began,
er begunde im wol gevallen.
vor den andern allen
sin herze in sunder uz erlas,
wan er von sinem bluote was:
diu nature zoh in dar. (3238 ff.)

And thruout the epic the attraction of the uncle to the nephew is pictured even more strongly.

Priamus, in the *Trojanische Krieg,* is powerfully drawn to his son who is unknown to him:

in lerte diu nature daz
und der sippeschefte reht,
daz im der junge süeze kneht
wart übermaezeclichen trut.
swie Priamus niht über lut
erkande, daz er was sin kint,
doch truoc er im an underbint
gar innecliche friuntschaft,
wan sippebluot daz hat die kraft,
daz ez vil kume sich verhilt.
ez lachet magen unde spilt
engegen durch der ougen türe
und machet iemer sich her füre,
swa friunt gesitzet friunde bi.
swie tiefe ez da verborgen si,
ez wirt ze liehte schiere braht:
da von der künec was verdaht
uf Parisen deste me.
ez was sin sun von rehter e,
des truoc in diu nature dar
uf den juncherren wunnevar
und spilt im allez tougen
engegen durch diu ougen.
Im seite sin gemüete,
daz an in beiden blüete
der waren sippeschefte fruht. (3204 ff.)

Similarly, Paris' grandfather, Lamedon, feels the relationship at sight:

do Paris kam ze hove dar
and in Lamedon ersach,
do truoc er vröudenrich gemach
von des juncherren güete.
im seite ouch sin gemüete,
daz er im sippe waere. (4694 ff.)

Valentin, in *Valentin und Namelos,* defends his mother Phila, not knowing her identity. In the words of the poet,

aldar sehen der naturen kraft
unde der elementen macht. (1619 f.)

Arriving at Artus' court, Wigalois, in the epic of that name, is liked by all, especially by his unknown father Gawan. They feel the cry of their common blood:

ir geselleschaft diu was guot
beidiu ir herze unde ir muot
warn einander heimlich,
deiswar, daz was billich,
sit si eines libes waren.
ir ougen des niht verbaren
sine lacheten ofte einander an.

In *Wilhelm von Wenden,* the father has sold his two sons in their infancy. When these brothers meet later in life unknown to each other, their common blood speaks to them:

ietweder an den andern sach.
ir muot, ir geliche jach
friuntschaft an dem andern.
ir unkuntliches wandern
daz sie vor heten getan,
ir sorge truoc uf fröuden ban,
unkuntlicher sippe kraft
brahte in werder liebe haft
dise edeln vrien jungen,
daz ir herze zesamen rungen.
ieglicher bi im selben jach,
so lieben friunt er nie gesach
und bi dem er gerner waere. (4922 ff.)

These two brothers are forced, because of their need, to practice robbery in the forest. The father, who by chance is appointed by the queen of the land to investigate the robberies, arrives suddenly and unexpectedly in their camp, where he confronts them. Even in this exceedingly tense situation, and with a psychology which to us is strikingly false, parent and sons feel the call of their common blood! Springing up in the greatest fear, the two sons nevertheless stand as tho banned, for

ieglicher mit im selben jach
daz er nie man so gerne gesach.
diu nature seite in daz.
Willalm in sinen sinnen maz
mit warer liebe phlihte.
sinen ougen ze gesihte

nie kamen zwene junge man
die in duhten so wol getan
die er so gerne ie gesach. (6083 ff.)

As they sit and talk,

Willehalm, dem was also
er enwurde von herzen nie so vro;
also daz in diu maere
hete wunder, wavon daz waere,
wannen im diu fröude kaeme,
diu im swaere so gar benaeme. (6113 ff.)

It is interesting to contrast the viewpoint we have been considering with that of modern literature, with its reflection of an entirely different social structure. Since those early times a great change has taken place. As early as the sixth century the organization of society in Europe in kin groups had begun to disintegrate, and by the twelfth to the fourteenth century these had entirely crumbled away. More or less concomitant with this outer change, an inner transformation has taken place. While the individual has been gradually loosened from the closely woven social fabric in which he had been enmeshed, a strong and persistent current has widened, deepened and intensified the inner life of the individual, accentuating his independence and freedom of thought,—a development which has culminated in the scientific and philosophic achievement of the present day.

The meeting of unknown relatives is not a rare motif in modern literature. It receives probably its most modern treatment at the hands of that most typically modern German poet, Lessing. His thoughtful drama, *Nathan der Weise,* is the story of a family the members of which have become scattered, meet unknown, and are finally reunited.

Adventure and love lead the Sultan's brother, Assad, to Europe, where he marries a Christian wife and becomes a Christian knight under the name Wolf von Filnek. Leaving their son behind in the care of a maternal uncle, the wife accompanies the knight back to Palestine, where she dies upon birth of a daughter. The father himself dies shortly after in battle, having just before his death confided his motherless infant to the care of the friendly Jew, Nathan, who rears the child as his own daughter. Assad's

son, having become a Templar, proceeds to Palestine, where he is captured by the Mohemmedans and condemned to death. At the critical moment of the execution the Sultan Saladin, who is in reality the paternal uncle, is struck by what he takes to be the prisoner's accidental resemblance to his own long lost brother Assad, and, following the impulse of the moment, pardons him.

In this incident as pictured by Lessing there is not the slightest trace of blood attraction. It is merely a matter of the recognition of physical resemblance. How strong the Templar's resemblance to his father is, we learn from Nathan, who has known the father, and who, after the first meeting with the Templar, ejaculates:

> Nicht allein
> Wolfs Wuchs, Wolfs Gang, auch seine Stimme. So,
> Volkommen so, warf Wolf sogar den Kopf,
> Trug Wolf sogar das Schwert im Arm, strich Wolf
> Sogar die Augenbraunen mit der Hand,
> Gleichsam das Feuer seines Blicks zu bergen. (1390 f.)

How entirely natural this recognition of resemblance is conceived to be we also learn from the mouth of Nathan:

> Warum hätte Saladin,
> Der sein Geschwister insgesamt so liebt,
> In jüngern Jahren einen Bruder nicht
> Noch ganz besonders lieben können?—Pflegen
> Sich zwei Gesichter nicht zu ähneln?—Ist
> Ein alter Eindruck ein verlorner?—Wirkt
> Das Nämliche nicht mehr das Nämliche?—
> Seit wenn?—Wo steckt hier das Unglaubliche?—
> Ei freilich, weise Daja, wär's für dich
> Kein Wunder mehr. (259 f.)

In the mediæval epic this uncle and nephew would have been strongly attracted to each other at once, and even without the motivation of resemblance would have felt their kinship. In Lessing's drama, altho the nephew's resemblance to his father is so striking as to stir the emotions of the Sultan and to prompt him to spare the Templar's life, neither character is drawn towards the other nor does either form the faintest notion that they may be related. The Sultan's emotional impulse is solely in recollection of his brother, and his indifference to the Templar is shown by his promptly ignoring and forgetting the man whose life he has spared (1357 ff., 2090 ff.).

We find a further illustration in this same drama in the meeting of the Templar and his unknown sister Recha. When all human help appears impossible, she is suddenly rescued from Nathan's burning house by a stranger, the Knight Templar. Here again there is no trace of blood attraction. "*Kalt und ungerührt*" are the adjectives used to describe how, amid the cries of thanks, he leaves his prize, passes thru the wondering crowd, and disappears. Having performed his deed of heroism solely thru an instinctive feeling of duty, the Templar proudly holds aloof from every expression of thanks, and refuses even to see again the girl whom he has rescued. Now if in anyone, then certainly in Recha, with her keen woman's intuition, we should expect to find some sensing of the relationship existing between them, but thruout the play there is no such intimation. She feels an unlimited gratitude toward her savior, and at first even accepts her rescue as a miracle performed by God thru an angel. In her soul there are, however, no other feelings nor motives than a passionate thankfulness. Having seen and thanked the Templar, Recha is perfectly calm again, is indeed herself puzzled

> wie
> Auf einen solchen Sturm in ihrem Herzen
> So eine Stille plötzlich folgen könne. (1711 ff.)

and Daja even refers to Recha's attitude as cold (1730 f.). So entirely free is the sister from any touch of love for the Templar that she even fails to observe or understand the flaming love she has aroused in him (Act III, Scene III, 1692 ff.), or to understand the allusions to her own supposed love which are made by Nathan (Act II, Sc. IV, 1160 ff.), by Daja (Act III, Sc. III, 1695 ff.), and again by Saladin (Act V, Sc. VIII, 3670 ff.). And when at the meeting in Saladin's place it is revealed that the Templar and Recha are brother and sister, she rushes to him at once with the joyful cry: "Ah! mein Bruder!" For there has been no love in her bosom to cause now a revulsion of feelings upon this startling revelation.

The subterranean working of the blood need not be invoked to explain the fact that the Templar, on the other hand, falls in love with Recha upon visiting her. It is no more probable that the blood would urge him to love his unknown sister than that it would warn him against an incestuous relationship. Some critics do, indeed,

ascribe the Templar's love to the misunderstood call of the blood,[1] but this is not Lessing. They have failed to understand the author's purpose and to grasp his motivation. Altho the Templar's is an ardent love, it is of a distinctly different type from that of Faust for Gretchen. It is Nathan's idealism in Recha which captivates him. So completely does the youthful and enthusiastic Templar fall under the spell of Nathan's nobility of soul and his broadminded and lofty humanitarianism, that when Nathan, at the end of their first interview, once more urges the Templar to see the girl he has been scorning, the youth replies:

> Ich brenne vor Verlangen. (1323)

In a piece of clear self-analysis which occurs in a monolog in the fifth act, the Templar recognizes the root of his love as springing from the fact that Recha is Nathan's creation:

> Geschöpf?
> Und wessen?—Doch des Sklaven nicht, der auf
> Des Lebens öden Strand den Block geflösst
> Und sich davon gemacht? Des Künstlers doch
> Wohl mehr, der in dem hingeworfnen Blocke
> Die göttliche Gestalt sich dachte, die
> Er dargestellt?—Ach! Rechas wahrer Vater
> Bleibt, trotz dem Christen, der sie zeugte—bleibt
> In Ewigkeit der Jude. Wenn ich mir
> Sie lediglich als Christendirne denke,
> Sie sonder alles das mir denke, was
> Allein ihr so ein Jude geben könnte—
> Sprich, Herz,—was wär an ihr, das dir gefiel?
> Nichts! Wenig! Selbst ihr Lächeln, wär' es nichts
> Als sanfte schöne Zuckung ihrer Muskeln.
> Wär' was sie lächeln macht, des Reizes unwert,
> In den es sich auf ihrem Munde kleidet:—
> Nein, selbst ihr Lächeln nicht! Ich hab' es ja
> Wohl schöner noch an Aberwitz, an Tand,
> Höhnerei, an Schmeichler und an Buhler,
> Verschwenden sehn!—Hat's da mich auch bezaubert?
> Hat's da mir auch den Wunsch entlockt, mein Leben
> In seinem Sonnenscheine zu verflattern?
> Ich wüsste nicht! (3243 ff.)

The Templar's love for Recha thus symbolizes the victory of the noble principles for which Nathan stands, just as the final re-

[1] Kettner, *Lessings Dramen*, 399 ff.; Witkowski, *Lessings Werke*, II, 246.

uniting of the entire family symbolizes the harmonizing of the religions of which the various family members are representatives, on the basis of tolerance and common humanity. It is because of the ideal tinge to this love that the Templar, and we with him, do not recoil too violently when Nathan reveals that the Templar and Recha are brother and sister. Otherwise, our feelings at such an outcome would be distinctly unpleasant. There is naturally a strong clash of emotions in the Templar's breast at so startling a revelation, but after a short struggle he is able to turn to Nathan with the remark:

> Ihr nehmt und gebt mir, Nathan!
> Mit vollen Händen beides!—Nein! Ihr gebt
> Mir mehr, als Ihr mir nehmt! unendlich mehr!
> Ah meine Schwester! meine Schwester! (3803 ff.)

It must be explicitly pointed out that none of these family members had suspected that they were related. The suspicion arose only in the mind of a third party, Nathan, and the fact is established not by the voice of the blood but by outside documentary evidence.

Our conviction that Lessing would answer with a categorical "No!" the question as to whether there is a blood attraction between relatives is further strengthened by the author's clear pronouncement in the case of the deep and genuine reciprocal love between Recha and her foster-parent Nathan. When Recha, in her great anguish over the fear of losing a father in Nathan, cries out:

> Aber macht denn nur das Blut
> Den Vater? nur das Blut? (3654 f.)

thru the mouth of the Sultan Lessing gives the modern answer to her question:

> —das Blut, das Blut allein
> Macht lange noch den Vater nicht! macht kaum
> Den Vater eines Tieres, gibt zum höchsten
> Das erste Recht, sich diesen Namen zu
> Erwerben! (3662 ff.)

Here is a clear expression of our modern view that the blood is not the essential in human relationships,—that true relationship springs from relation,—is more essentially a matter of post-natal association than of pre-natal, physiological facts. Altho we

still yield a measure of allegiance to the weakening tradition of the natural fondness of kin, we of to-day clearly realize that there is no mystical attraction of the blood, no tropesis which irresistibly draws relatives together. The tie between parent and child, brother and sister, uncle and nephew is the tie of affection resultant from association, plus, usually, a kindly disposition springing from an intellectual interest in the fact that the relative is of our descent; but it is nothing more. There may be a certain measure of compatibility, or, indeed, of incompatibility, due to similarity of temperament and inherited characteristics. It must be granted that the features of a relative, at a meeting incognito, might well set echoes reverberating in the mind and heart by their dim suggestion of some loved one. But if physical resemblance did not assist in recognition, a meeting of a parent and child, or of a brother and sister unknown to each other would ordinarily be a matter of utter indifference on each side. The discovery of kinship would impart an intellectual interest which might be pleasant or unpleasant according to the circumstances.

Thus our viewpoint, in keeping with the social and scientific tendencies of the times, has shifted radically from that of the mediæval German epic. To us the viewpoint of the epic is false and exaggerated. It cannot be entirely explained as a phase of the crude hyperbole which characterizes the mediæval epic, for it flows naturally from the emphasis which the times placed upon kin. A society which looks upon the members of the *Sippe* as the members of a single organic body but naturally entertains the belief that blood is potent to find its way to blood. How primitive this viewpoint is, is a question that cannot be entered into here. It is interesting to note that no trace of such belief is to be found in the much earlier *Hildebrandslied*, where the inability of the son to recognize the father leads to deadly combat. It is a viewpoint which seems particularly characteristic of the mediæval world, and may have been influenced by the Christianity and mysticism of that period.

Clair Hadyn Bell.

University of California.

AN EARLY EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENTHUSIAST FOR PRIMITIVE POETRY: JOHN HUSBANDS

A Miscellany of Poems, collected by a person of the name of Husbands, was published at Oxford in 1731. In that Miscellany, Johnson's Translation of the Messiah appeared, with this modest motto from Scaliger's Poetics, *Ex alieno ingenio Poeta, ex suo tantum versificator.*

This brief statement of Boswell's,[1] supplemented by a few details assembled by later students of Johnson,[2] represents all that even specialists have thought worth knowing concerning John Husbands. Yet he deserves a larger place in literary history than has so far been accorded him; for in addition to being the first editor of Johnson, he was a pioneer, and a singularly enthusiastic one at that, in the great movement of curiosity about the poetry of primitive peoples which in the next generation, with Gray and Percy and Diderot and Herder, was to constitute one of the most characteristic elements in European Pre-Romanticism.[3]

I

The known facts of Husbands' life are few. He was born at Marsh Baldon, Oxfordshire, in February, 1706. After attending school at Hereford, he matriculated in 1721 at Pembroke College, Oxford, and graduated B. A. in 1725 and M. A. in 1728. In the latter year he took orders and was elected a Fellow of his college. In 1731 he edited and published by subscription the *Miscellany* already referred to;[4] with the exception of a set of Latin verses on the death of George I and the accession of George II (1727), it appears to have been his only publication. He was preparing

[1] *Life of Samuel Johnson*, ed. Croker (London, 1839), 1, 61.

[2] See W. P. Courtney, *A Bibliography of Samuel Johnson* (Oxford, 1915), p. 1. There is no article on Husbands in the *Dictionary of National Biography.*

[3] Cf. P. Van Tieghem, "La notion de vraie poésie dans les Préromantisme européen," *Revue de littérature comparée*, Avril-Juin 1921, pp. 225-30.

[4] A Miscellany of Poems By several Hands. Publish'd by J. Husbands, A. M. Fellow of Pembroke-College, Oxon. . . . Oxford: Printed by Leon. Lichfield, near the East-Gate, In the Year MDCCXXXI. 8vo. I have used the copy in the Newberry Library, Chicago.

for the press another work, a *Comparison of the Eastern and Western Poetry,* when he died, November 21, 1732.[5]

In the absence of this last work, which was apparently never printed, it is to the *Miscellany* that we must look for Husbands' ideas. The volume contained sixty-one poems, all but about fifteen of which were the work of the editor himself. As a writer of verses, Husbands was satisfied to remain safely within the limits of the prevailing taste. Paraphrases of the Scriptures; translations or "imitations" of the ancients; odes, songs, epistles of a mildly amorous inspiration; moral and descriptive pieces reminiscent of Milton or Thomson—such were the directions, thoroughly typical of the second quarter of the century, which his efforts took. But the *Miscellany* contained also, in addition to the poems, a long Preface of over a hundred pages, which more than made up in the freshness and interest of its views for the commonplaceness of the verses that followed.

The starting-point of the Preface, certain preliminary remarks aside, was a vigorous plea for the renewed cultivation of "Divine Poetry" in England.[6] To Husbands, as to Dennis[7] and Addison[8] in the preceding generation and to Thomson[9] among contemporaries, the great weakness of early eighteenth-century verse was its lack of religious idealism. Of late, he complained, "the *Poetical* Character has . . . been separated from the *religious.* Our *Beaux Esprits* lay the Foundations of Wit upon the Ruins of good Manners and Decency, and because they can be witty upon no other Theme, make their pretensions to it by Irreligion and Prophaneness." And yet "so many Arguments of the Goodness of the Deity offer themselves to our View, as are sufficient to make the most Insensible break forth into Poetry. . . . Every Leaf and Herb, the Birds of the Air, the Flowers of the Field, and even the Clods of the Valley, bring his Creator to his Remembrance."

[5] For the biographical facts given in this paragraph, see besides the account in Courtney, *op. cit.*, *A Miscellany*, p. 170 and *The Gentleman's Magazine*, November 1732, p. 1083.

[6] As the pages of the Preface are unnumbered, it is impossible to give detailed references for the quotations in the text.

[7] *The Grounds of Criticism in Poetry* (London, 1704), in W. H. Durham, *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century* (New Haven, 1915), pp. 193-211.

[8] *Spectator*, No. 453 (1712).

[9] *Winter*, second edition (London, 1726), Preface.

Moreover, the "Mind of Man naturally delights in what is great and unbounded, and has room here to exert all her Faculties." What was needed to restore imagination and religious fervor to poetry was a more intensive study and imitation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Here were to be found the supreme models for contemporary genius. "What innumerable Beauties might our Poetry be furnish'd with from those sacred Repositories? . . . These are the Writings which far surpass all human Compositions. . . . They exceed in Beauty and Propriety any Thing that was ever wrote by Man. The greatest Genius's among the Ancients fall infinitely short of the inspir'd Books."

In order that the imitation thus proposed might be really fruitful, it was essential to understand the true character of Hebrew poetry and the reasons for its superiority over other models. To these questions Husbands devoted the main body of his Preface.

II

He began—and this for us is the most significant part of his discussion—by distinguishing two general types of poetry—the poetry of nature and the poetry of art. "As Nations improv'd in Knowledge and Politeness, the Sciences grew up gradually, and flourish'd with them in Proportion; Systems in time were form'd, Methods of attaining to the Knowledge of them propos'd, and Precepts establish'd; so that what was originally natural became at length artificial. Hence Poetry (as People grew more refin'd) was reduc'd to Rules, and became an Art." The "Writers of the first Ages," on the other hand, "had no other Guide than Nature. The Essence of Poetry consists in a just and natural Imitation and Illustration of Things by Words, tending at once both to improve, and please: It consists moreover in a lively and affecting Manner of Writing, adorn'd with Figures, varying according to the Greatness, Nature, and Quality of the Subject. This may be call'd natural Poetry, which (as was said) gave Birth to the methodical and artificial."

Remains of "natural Poetry," in merit sometimes equal if not superior to the "artificial" masterpieces of Greece and Rome, were to be found among nearly all peoples, for as the human mind is "naturally turn'd for Harmony and Numbers," poetry was in the beginning the "universal Language of Men." Husbands him-

self had noted a number of instances in the course of his reading and conversation. He had learned (perhaps from Montaigne)[10] of the existence of poetry among the Indians of America; he had acquired some knowledge of the Lapland poems printed by Scheffer (possibly no more than could be gleaned from Nos. 366 and 406 of the *Spectator*); he had become familiar with Ole Worm's account of Old Norse poetry in his *Danica Literatura,* and apparently with Sir William Temple's remarks on the same subject in his essay *Of heroic Virtue;* he had been told by a friend who knew Welsh of the Odes of Taliessin; and he had read Selden's notes on the ancient British bards in Drayton's *Polyolbion.* All this was little enough, to be sure, when compared with what Gray or Percy knew of the same material a generation later; but it was sufficient to inspire him with an enthusiasm scarcely less marked than theirs, and, when one considers its date, even more significant. In early times, he wrote,

> Poetry was not confin'd only to the politer Nations. We may find some Remains of it among the most uncultivated People, and trace its Footsteps even beneath the Pole. The frozen *Laplander* is susceptible of this Fire, as well as the Sunburnt *American.* Witness those beautiful Odes preserv'd by *Scheffer,* and those noble Strains of Poetry which the Learned *Olaus Wormius* has given us in his RUNICK Antiquities. The Respect and Distinction which their RUNES or SCALDRI met with, was very extraordinary.[11] And 'tis really surprizing to find among those Nations, that are accounted *Barbarous,* Poems that may vie with any of the Performances of *Greece* or *Rome.* SCALLAGRIM'S Ode is very much in the Spirit of PINDAR, and comes up to almost any Thing We find in Him.[12] And I have been told by a Gentleman of a very good Taste, who understands that Tongue, that the *Welsh* Odes of *Taliessin* are equal to any thing in Antiquity. 'Tis indeed very certain, that the ancient BRITAINS gave great Encouragement to the Muses. [Then follows an account of the three orders of poets among the Britains, drawn from Selden's notes on *Polyolbion,* Book IV.]

---

[10] *Essais,* liv. I, ch. xxxi (ed. Dezeimeris et Barckhausen, Bordeaux, 1870, p. 180).

[11] A note to this sentence gives the text of two passages from Worm's Appendix.

[12] Temple had made the same comparison in his essay *Of heroic Virtue:* "I am deceived, if in this Sonnet, and a following Ode of *Scallogrim* . . . there be not a vein truly Poetical, and in its kind Pindarick . . ." (*Miscellanea,* The Second Part . . ., Third Edition, London, 1692, p. 240).

In the same category of "natural" poetry as the Norse and Welsh Odes, Husbands placed the "ancient Poetry of the *Hebrews.*" Its writers

> imitated Nature without Art, and without Study describ'd agreeably Things, Sentiments, and Affections. For the Strength and Energy of the Figures, and the true Sublimity of Style, are a natural Effect of the Passions. No wonder therefore that their Diction is something more flourish'd and ornamental, more vigorous and elevated, more proper to paint and act Things before our Eyes, than plain and ordinary Recitals. This sort of Poetry is more simple, and at the same time worthy of the Majesty of God, than that which is regular and confin'd, which must with Difficulty express the Dictates of the Holy Spirit, and wou'd be apt to give some Alloy to the Sublimity of the Sense.

Thus for Husbands the explanation of the superiority of the Hebrew writers over "the greatest Genius's among the Ancients" lay in the fact that they were, like the Bards and Scalds of Northern Europe, the poets of a primitive people, whose only guide, divine inspiration apart, was Nature.

III

How fundamental this postulate of the primitiveness of Hebrew poetry was for Husbands will appear from an analysis of his treatment of Old Testament meter and style. All attempts to reduce Hebrew versification to classical regularity seemed to him misleading and absurd. It was as impossible, he thought, to collect "any settled Prosody" from the Scriptures as from the *Versi sciolti* of the Italians or from a modern Pindaric; and this for the reason that regular meter was "too artificial for those simple Times." "It is not to be doubted, that the first Poets were very inaccurate in the Art of Numbers. . . . How deficient in this respect were our old English Poets?" They had indeed a "determin'd Stanza" and "stated Numbers of different kinds, which they call'd, Englyns, Cythdhs, & Athdls.[13] . . . But how unsettled our Poetry was, may be seen even in the Days of *Chaucer, Lidgate,* and *Gower.* . . ." In short, the supposition of modern critics that Hebrew poetry was written in regular and exact meter could proceed only from a disregard of its true character as poetry of "nature."

[13] Husbands again refers to Selden's notes on Book IV of *Polyolbion.*

As with meter, so with the other qualities of style. The "bold and lofty Expressions" of the Hebrew writers; their peculiar habit of using abstract terms for concrete—"a very strong, and forcible Manner of Expression"; their fondness for personifications; their "beautiful Repetitions"; their similes and comparisons "taken from sensible and familiar Objects, with which those, to whom the sacred Authors wrote, were daily conversant"; their numerous allegories; their descriptions, "more strong and lively than those in any of the Poets"; their extraordinary combination of simplicity and sublimity—these traits, which Husbands exemplified at great length, especially from Job, Genesis, the Psalms, and the Prophets, were so many illustrations of "that lively and affecting Manner of Writing" which he had declared to be one of the marking characteristics of "Natural Poetry." The "primitivism" of his point of view stood out with especial clearness in a passing comparison of the poetry of the Hebrews with that of the modern Europeans:

> Their Phrases are certainly more ardent and intense than Those in any *European* Language, and the Figures more bold and vehement. Tho' Their Poetry was less artificial, 'twas more nervous, lively, and expressive than ours. They have nothing of the *Finesse*, Nothing that is over-wrought. This renders them so vivid, beautiful, and affecting. In a Word, there seems to be the same Difference between the *Oriental* and *European* Poetry, as between their Gardens and Plantations. Ours perhaps are disposed with greater Elegance, Order, and Regularity; but the inartificial Beauties, and agreeable Rudeness of Theirs, where Nature appears in all her Charms, and unsubdu'd by Art, give a wild and perhaps more forcible pleasure to the Mind.

Here, then, was a body of poetry to which, because it was "natural Poetry" and still more the "natural Poetry" of an Oriental people, the standards of classical European art could not be made to apply. As to its essential superiority over the poetry produced by the aid of those standards, Husbands himself had no doubt: "the Genius of the *East*," he declared, "soars upon stronger Wings and takes a loftier Flight, than the Muse of *Greece*, or *Rome*." But he was aware that there were many among his readers who would demand stronger arguments than mere assertion to convince them of the justness of his view. For such he adopted two distinct, if not contradictory, lines of persuasion. On the one hand, he multiplied parallels from Greek, Roman, and

English writers to the beauties of the Old Testament for the purpose of stressing the *likenesses* which after all existed between the two bodies of poetry. On the other hand, and with emphasis now rather upon the *differences* which his whole treatment had served to throw into relief, he appealed for the final justification of Hebrew poetry to the principle of relativity in taste: European poetry was to be judged by European canons, Oriental poetry by Oriental:

> Our Art of Criticism is drawn from the Writers of *Rome* and *Athens*, whom We make the Standard of Perfection. But why have not the *Jews* as much Right to prescribe to *Them*, as *They* have to prescribe to the *Jews?* Yet to this Test We endeavour to bring the sacred Books, not considering that the Genius and Customs of the *Israelites*, were in many things very different from those of the *Greeks* or *Romans*. This is just as if an Inhabitant of *Bantam* shou'd endeavour to adjust our Behaviour, according to the Manners of his own Countrymen. . . .
>
> The Foundations of Criticism and Poetry, 'tis true, are the same in all Countries; yet the Idiom of a Language, and the Custom of Speaking, will warrant That amongst one People, which wou'd not be allowable amongst another. "Eloquence (says *Crusaz*) derives a relative Beauty from the Tempers or Conditions of the Persons to whom it is address'd. What in one Place, Time, or Circumstance is Proper, in another shall be Trifling and Absurd. . . ." Now, as the common way of speaking among the People of the *East* is vastly more elevated than Ours, so We must allow them to go beyond Us in the Warmth and Energy of their Figures. There is a great Difference in this Respect, between our colder Climates, and those warmer Regions, the Inhabitants of which, as they live nearer to the Sun, seem to partake more of his Heat and Vigour. . . .

IV

Such, in brief, were the ideas of John Husbands on primitive poetry. Viewed as the conclusions of a young Oxford man writing in 1731, a generation before the appearance of the epoch-making works of Lowth, Percy, or Mallet, what is their significance for English literary history?

Originality in any absolute sense they of course did not have. To begin with, interest in the Bible as literature was no new thing in 1731, in spite of Husbands' declaration that he did not "remember to have seen this Subject handled *ex professo* by any One." Robert Boyle's *Some Considerations touching the Style of the Holy Scriptures* (1663); Jean Leclerc's *Essai . . . où l'on tâche*

de montrer en quoi consiste la poésie des Hébreux (1688; translated in 1692);[14] William Nichols' *Conference with a Theist*, Part IV (1699); Robert Jenkin's *Reasonableness and Certainty of the Christian Religion*, Book II (1700);[15] several papers in the *Spectator*, notably Nos. 327, 339, 453 (1712); Henry Felton's *Dissertation on Reading the Classics* (1713);[16] *The Creation. A Pindarick Illustration of a Poem, Originally written by Moses. With a Preface to Mr. Pope, concerning the Sublimity of the Ancient Hebrew Poetry* (1720);[17] Charles Gildon's *Laws of Poetry* (1721);[18] Fénelon's *Dialogues Concerning Eloquence* (translated, 1722);[19] Calmet's *Dictionnaire . . . de la Bible* (1722-24);[20] A. Blackwall's *Sacred Classics defended and illustrated* (1725)—these were but a few of the many works known to English readers in which, before 1731, the style of the Scriptures was analyzed, its Oriental character demonstrated, and its superiority to the classical style proclaimed in no uncertain terms. The concept of relativity in taste, too, had already had champions;[21] and Husbands in affirming that the Bible was to be judged by standards different from the classical did little more than echo the conclusion of Nichols a generation before, that it was "a great Mistake, to account the *Greek* and *Latin* Eloquence to be the only true Standard of Eloquence; for they are only the Standards of the Eloquence of those Nations . . .; but they are far from being the Standards

[14] In *The Young Students Library* . . . By the Athenian Society, London, 1692, pp. 294-311.

[15] This work I have not seen. It is analyzed in the *History of the Works of the Learned*, August 1700, pp. 483-84.

[16] Third edition, 1723, pp. 110-14.

[17] Listed in Durham, *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century*, p. 430. I have been unable to find a copy.

[18] Pp. 103-04, 115-21.

[19] By William Stevenson. See especially the Third Dialogue, pp. 133-98. Husbands quotes at length from this text toward the beginning of his Preface.

[20] Nouvelle édition (Paris, 1730), III, 237-38.

[21] See the texts cited by G. M. Miller, *The Historical Point of View in English Literary Criticism* (Heidelberg, 1913), pp. 20-23, and in addition, Nichols, *A Conference with a Theist* (1699), Third Edition (1723), II, 72-74, 90-91, 104; Hughes, "Remarks on the *Fairy Queen*" (1715), in Durham, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-06; and B. Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees*, II (London, 1729), 353 ff.

of the *Eastern* Eloquence, to which they bear very little or no Analogy." [22] Again, for the distinction which Husbands made between natural and artificial poetry and for the value which he attached to the former, there were precedents both in Addison's discussion in *Spectator* No. 160 of the "natural Genius" as opposed to the genius formed by rules, and in the rhapsodies of Shaftesbury over "things of a natural kind, where neither art nor the conceit or caprice of man has spoiled their genuine order by breaking in upon that primitive state." [23] Finally, Husbands was not the first to dwell upon the universality of poetry even "among the most uncultivated People"—the theme had been a commonplace even when Sidney introduced it into the *Apologie for Poetrie* [24]—, or to interest himself in the remains of primitive literatures other than the Hebrew—Temple's remarks on ancient Scandinavian poetry in his essays *Of heroic Virtue* and *Of Poetry* (1690); Hickes' translation of the *Incantation of Hervor* (1705); Steele's quotation of two Lapland odes in the *Spectator* (1712); the elder Thomas Warton's versions of the *Death Song of Regner Lodbrog* and of Montaigne's *American Love-Ode* (published in 1748, but apparently composed before 1723),[25] all antedated his studies in this field. In short, so far as the separate elements or ideas of the Preface are concerned, it contained little that a diligent reader of 1731 might not have collected from this or that earlier source.

But if various earlier writers anticipated the individual points of view or interests to be found in Husbands' pages, none of them—at least none whose writings are known to us—achieved anything precisely like his synthesis of these elements. To bring Hebrew Scriptures, Lapland songs, Runic and Welsh Odes together under the general concept of "natural" or primitive poetry, and to proclaim them, in certain qualities at least, equal or even superior to the Greek or Roman classics—this was

[22] *Conference, ed. cit.*, II, 73.

[23] *Characteristics*, ed. J. M. Robertson (New York, 1900), II, 125.

[24] For Sidney's source see Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (Oxford, 1904), I, 383-84. Several other texts of the same sort are given in Sir Thomas Pope Blount's *De Re Poetica* (London, 1694), pp. 1-5. The classic treatment of the theme in eighteenth-century literature was of course in Gray's *Progress of Poesy*, II, ii.

[25] D. H. Bishop, in *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, XVI (1917), 364.

to do something essentially new. And because he did it, and did it with an enthusiasm and outspokenness which it would be hard to parallel anywhere before the second half of the century, Husbands deserves to be remembered among the critics and scholars who in the heart of the "classical" age were helping to prepare men's minds for the coming transformation of literary taste and ideas.

RONALD S. CRANE.

Northwestern University.

DANTE NOTES

I. DANTE'S OBLIGATIONS TO ALBERTUS MAGNUS

Another unmistakable instance of Dante's indebtedness to Albertus Magnus may be added to those given by Toynbee in *Romania*, XXIV (1895), 399-412:

Convivio, II, 15[1]: ". . . quello albore, il quale noi chiamiamo Galassia. E puote essere che *il cielo in quella parte è più spesso, e però ritiene e ripresenta quello lume; e questa opinione pare avere, con Aristotile, Avicenna e Tolommeo.*"

Compare:

Meteororum, Lib. I, Tractatus II, cap. VI[2]: ". . . circulus qui dicitur galaxia. . . . Causa autem materialis quae est subjectum, est *pars illa orbis quae spissior est alia parte orbis, et ideo retinens et repraesentans lumen* solis et stellarum, et terminans visum per eumdem modum quo stellae retinent lumen et repraesentant et visum terminant. Et hujus signum est quod compertum est probatione astronomica, quod circulus galaxiae movetur motu stellarum fixarum: hoc autem in centum annis gradu uno. Cujus autem motus est motus stellarum fixarum, oportet quod sit de natura stellarum: *et haec est sententia Ptolemaei et Avicennae* et aliorum Philosophorum *et etiam Aristotelis.*"

II. LEGNO? (*Purg.*, VII, 74)

After all the likely places have been searched in vain, an old maxim suggests looking into the unlikely ones. Certainly, the probabilities have been exhausted for the elucidation of that moot

[1] Moore, *Tutte le Opere di Dante Alighieri*, Oxford, 1904, p. 268.
[2] Albertus Magnus, *Opera omnia*, Paris, 1890-98, IV, 496-7.

line: "Indico legno lucido e sereno . . ."; and they are much rather *im*probabilities to the candid mind. Shall we not try the mere possibilities now?

What did Dante mean by this "legno"? But, did he write "legno"? An over-bold question perhaps, but of a boldness born of desperation. For consider the problem systematically: if we accept the line as printed we must either (1) take "indico" alone; this leaves "legno" described indeed, but not limited; and "shining clear wood" is clear nonsense, in this context; or (2) construe "indico legno" together, and choose between: (*a*) ebony—with a host of older commentators; off-color in every sense and utterly unsatisfactory; (*b*) amber—with Miss Cook;[3] bathetic and unconvincing; and, finally, (*c*) some yet unidentified "Indian wood" *par excellence*, intrinsically lucent and bland, and, we fervently augur, bright-colored, fit to rank in sheer pulchritude with precious metals, glowing pigments, and gems, and to adumbrate loveliest flowers. Till that radiant wood, to Dante famed but to us forgotten, be rediscovered, it may not be wholly otiose to glimpse a possibility in something I ran across in Isidore of Seville. It is at least interesting: Isid., *Etym.*, Lib. XVI, cap. XIV, 4; in Dionysii Gothofredi, *Auctores Latinae Linguae in unum redacti corpus* . . . Genevae, 1622; [given as cap. XIII in this edition], col. 1221 [misnumbered "1222"]:

LIGNIS ex eodem genere ardentium [*sc.* gemmarum] est, appellata a *luc*ernarum flagrantia. Gignitur in multis locis, sed probatissima apud *Indos*. Quidam eam remissiorem carbunculum dixerunt. Hujus duplex facies: una quae purpura radiat; altera quae *cocci* rubore.[4]

Solinus, *Polyhistor.*, cap. LII, has:

LYCHNITEM perinde fert *India*, cujus *lucis* vigorem ardor excitat lucernarum, qua ex causa lychniten Graeci vocaverunt. Duplex ei facies: aut enim purpurea emicat claritate, aut meracius suffunditur *cocci* rubore, per omne intimum sui, siquidem pura sit, inoffensam admittens perspicuitatem.

---

[3] Mabel P. Cook, "Indico legno," in *PMLA*, XVIII (N. S., XI), 1903, pp. 356 ff.; reviewed by E. G. P[arodi?], in *Bull. della Soc. Dantesca Italiana*, N. S., XIII, 1906, pp. 74 ff.

[4] I italicize words suggestive of Dante's context, but without insisting too much on their significance as evidence.

Back of these is Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, Lib. XXXVII, 29:

Ex eodem genere ardentium [*sc.* gemmarum] LYCHNIS appellata a *luc*ernarum accensu, tamen praecipuae gratiae. Nascitur circa Orthosiam, totaque Caria, ac vicinis locis: sed probatissima in *Indis*, quam quidam remissiorem carbunculum esse dixerunt. Secunda bonitate similis est Ionia, appellata a praelatis *floribus*. Et inter has invenio differentiam: unam quae purpura radiat: alteram quae cocco.

The gender in all these passages is apparently feminine, and Dante unmistakably gives it as masculine; but this objection is far from crushing. For the names of this stone or similar ones were notably varied in their Greek and Latin forms, and what may not have happened at the hands of medieval gemmologists and scribes? Commenting on the Solinus passage, Claude Saumaise says:[5]

"LII. Lychnitem perinde fert India. . . ." "Legi debet etiam in . . . Plinio: *Lychnis appellata.* Nam si *lychnites* scripsisset, non foemineo genere id nomen enuntiasset. Varie concipiuntur apud antiquos hujus lapidis nomina. Nam et λυχνεύς dicitur, et λυχναῖος, ἡ λυχνὶς λυχνίδος, ἡ λυχνῖτις, ὁ λυχνίτης, et ὁ λύχνης τοῦ λύχνου. Nam ita in antiquis Dionysii codicibus scribitur: . . . Λύχνης . . . πυρὸς φλογὶ πάμπαν ὅμοιος. Plinio *lychnis* appellata est, ἡ λυχνὶς, ita legit Isidorus ex eodem auctore. Index manuscriptus: *Lythenis, genera ejus IIII.* Ubi *lythenis* perperam scriptum pro *lychnis.*"

The appearance, in Latin and Romance, of *g* for χ offers no novelty. Manuscripts of the extract from Solinus, for example, show "lygnitem" and "ligniten."[6] Dante, *Conv.*, I, 8, uses the phrase "li tegni," which Moore explains:[7] " . . . τέχναι; . . . the 'Liber Tegni' formed part of the curriculum of study at Bologna and Paris (see Rashdall, *Universities of Europe, &c.*, vol. I, pp. 247, 429)." Perhaps in this very passage (*Purg.*, VII, 74) Dante himself wrote "legni" (or even "ligni") for in *Chiose sopra Dante* | Testo inedito | ora per la prima volta pubblicato | Firenze | nella tipografia Piatti | 1846, I found it in the form "Indaco legnio."

But it is much more likely that the gap between the Greek and

[5] *Plinianae Exercitationes* in *C. J. Solini Polyhistora.*

[6] *C. Iulii Solini, Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium*, iterum recensuit Th. Mommsen, Berlin, 1895.

[7] *Dante Studies*, I, 297.

the Italian was spanned by a Latinized form of the whole phrase; the most ideally direct transition—and presumably altogether too good to be true—would be through the genitive of the last Greek type cited by Claude Saumaise, viz.: *ἰνδικοῦ λύχνου* > indici *ligni* > [genitive of Italian] indico *legno*.

Certainly, the purple color would be a suitable note in Dante's scale, more so than ebony-black, or even than amber in such brilliant company.[8] But, after all, Dante's effort is, evidently, not to compass the gamut of standard colors so much as to stress vividness and clearness: compared with the flowers of that Purgatorial slope, each of these precious metals, pigments, and gems[9] of lines 73-75 "saria di color vinto Come dal *suo maggiore* è vinto il meno."[10] This Indian gem, whose name was said to come from the Greek word for "lamp," had color enough (the scarlet campion was a homonym, it seems); but paramount were its brightness and its clearness: and note how closely "lucido e sereno" tally with the pair of qualities given by Solinus' "emicat claritate, aut . . . inoffensam admittens perspicuitatem."

Perhaps some lapidary to which I have not had access may supply the missing link. Meantime, I suggest to the next enterprising—if audacious—English translator of the *Divine Comedy*, that, inasmuch as the term "lychnis" has been appropriated to the flower, he render *Purg.*, VII, 74, "Indian *lychnite*." The word, if new, is authentic; and it has the true mineralogical ring.

H. D. Austin.

University of Southern California.

---

[8] Miss Cook, *l. c.*, sees a designed repetition of yellow tone, and advances a fanciful color-symmetry.

[9] Or are they *all* pigments, as Ruskin in his *Comments on the Divine Comedy* asserts? Dante in l. 79 says: "Non avea pur natura ivi *dipinto*. . . ." In this connection it is interesting to note what the "Anonymous Florentine" commentator of the XIV century says: ". . . . quello legno d'India, del quale si fa bellissimi vasi et di color *verdi*,"—and to speculate on what material he may have meant: malachite would fill the bill nicely, and its circular grain might easily have suggested *wood;* but!—Pliny seems to refer to it as an *Arabian* stone.

[10] Ll. 77-78.

The Origin of the German Carnival Comedy. By J. Maximilian Rudwin. New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1920.

Dr. Rudwin presents in this monograph the results of his investigation of the relation of German Carnival Comedy to the pagan rites performed annually by many primitive peoples to insure fertility. Among these rites were the expulsion of Death or Winter, a struggle between Winter and Summer, the procession, even in inland places, in which a *carrus navalis* or ship-cart containing emblems of fertility played the important part.

The author has brought together the evidence showing how wide spread among primitive nations and yet how similar in practice and spirit these rites were. He points out the survival in Carnival comedy of certain themes and types of characters borrowed from these rituals. Furthermore, he calls attention to the similarity of the ancient mime and the medieval carnival play in their use of marital infidelity as a motive, their ridicule of the Jew, monks, and peasants, their conception of female characters, etc. The explanation of this similarity, according to Dr. Rudwin, may be "due to their similar origin in the magical rites of the fertility worship, although foreign influence coming on the top of an independent growth in the Germanic Carnival customs need not be altogether denied" (p. 51).

Thus, Dr. Rudwin presents in a new field, strong evidence of the influence of the pagan rites to insure fertility in the origin and development of drama. Attending all investigations of this kind there is always the danger of ascribing customs, which are similar, to a common ritualistic origin, instead of regarding them as merely parallel customs due to their common origin in the human mind. However, except in somewhat minor instances, Dr. Rudwin has successfully avoided this pitfall which besets the path travelled by Frazer and his followers. Yet one cannot accept unreservedly the theory, based perhaps on a statement by Mr. Cornford, that the motive of resurrection from Hades found in the ritual "is employed in the Attic comedy when Æschylus is fetched up from the abode of the shades by the god of tragedy" (p. 23), since, as Mr.

Cornford has pointed out, it is hardly fair to lay too much stress upon the resurrection in the *Frogs* "because the whole conception of the plot demands that it shall be modelled on the Descent into Hades."[1] Furthermore, in two passages (pp. 24 and 44), Dr. Rudwin expresses the opinion that the motive of resurrection could not be used as a comical plot. On the other hand, although Mr. Cornford rightly minimizes the motive of resurrection in the *Frogs,* he gives enough other instances of the use of this motive to justify fully his statement: "If we look again at the series of Aristophanic plays, we shall not merely find isolated vestiges of this motive of resurrection, or rebirth, or renewal of life, but we shall see how it governs, in several cases, the general course of the action after the Agon."[2]

Also, Dr. Rudwin is perilously near the pitfall of Frazerism, when he says that "the *Antichoria*—the half-choruses performing antiphonally at the Easter service, in which the roots of the Church drama are found — may, indeed, have been adopted from the heathen spring ritual where, in their original function, they represented two opposing groups in the contest of Summer and Winter" (p. 51). Antiphonal song is so natural a procedure that it scarcely seems necessary to explain its use in any form of worship in which a chorus is employed; but, even if it be granted that *Antichoria* in the Christian ritual sprang from the pagan spring *dromenon,* the origin of sacred drama is not to be sought in *Antichoria* or any other dialog spoken or sung, but in the mimetic element in the ritual itself. The impulse toward mimesis is caused by the emotional ecstacy attendant upon religious rites which causes the celebrant to become an impersonator and makes the ritualistic celebration of an event a representation of that event.

Although Dr. Rudwin shows that certain episodes and characters are common to both the ritual and Carnival comedy, he does not find the "root of the Carnival plays" in what he calls the "ritual drama" or in any incident in the ritual such as the conflict of Spring and Winter. He says:

"Mr. Cornford's attempt to lead back the old Attic comedy through the folk-play to the ritual procedure, which he recon-

[1] F. M. Cornford, *The Origin of Attic Comedy,* London, 1914, p. 85.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 84.

structed with great ingenuity, has, in the opinion of the writer, not been very successful. The old Attic comedy, like the medieval German farce, does not show in its plot a similarity to the ritual sufficient to warrant any such assumption. The ritual in itself had but few histrionic possibilities. The parts of the medieval religious drama which were based on the church liturgy also proved incapable of dramatic evolution. Between the ritual and the drama, as we understand it, there yawns a mighty chasm. We can have drama only when a wholly new content has been given to the ritual. This fact applies with special force to comedy. The ritual plot, above all, can not be used for comical drama. The marriage, which forms the canonical ending of all our comedies, may, as Cornford suggests, be a survival of the ritual of the union of the sexes, but the central episode of the ritual drama, the death and resurrection of the fertility god, would in comedy, as Cornford admits, be either too serious or too silly" (p. 24).

Dr. Rudwin holds that the impersonators of the demons were the connecting link between the dramatic ritual to insure fertility and the Carnival comedy. He says that "episodes were added which had no connection with the magical ceremonies," and that the clownish demons "were asked to imitate certain individuals in the throng . . . and gladly exhibited their mimic talent" (pp. 38-39). The reviewer infers that, in Dr. Rudwin's opinion, the "new content" was thus given to the ritual. The author points out, on the authority of Semos, that a similar development took place among the Greeks when "the *phallophori* after having sung phallic songs ran forward and ridiculed persons in the audience" (p. 39). But does not the fact that such actions of *phallophori* probably helped to produce the parabasis—the undramatic element in Greek comedy—need to be noted and perhaps explained, if one seeks to derive a certain form of drama from such a custom?

Dr. Rudwin concludes a part of his thesis by expressing the opinion that all drama is of demonic origin and that "the Church Fathers were indeed right when they declared that all dramatic arts come from the devil" (p. 39). True as this statement is from the point of view that certain pagan gods, such as Dionysus, were merged in the medieval conception of the devil, the reader is at times troubled by the thought that in this passage and elsewhere the words "demonic" and "demon" might perhaps better be spelled "daimonic" and "daimon."

Dr. Rudwin's theory and conclusions are, at least, very interesting; and in view of the modern tendency to find the origin of

all episodes of all kinds of drama in the pagan ritual to insure fertility, it is striking to find a scholar who does not explain all the elements of the special kind of play he is investigating as arising from this ritual. From the evidence which Dr. Rudwin has presented in this monograph, and which he frankly admits is fragmentary, the reviewer sees no reason to disagree with the conclusions taken as a whole. It is perfectly possible that the relation of German Carnival comedy to these rites is to be explained in this way. On the other hand, since the reviewer shares the hope with Dr. Rudwin that investigation along these lines will be continued, it may not be out of place to make certain comments on the passages quoted above and some suggestions for the guidance of future investigators.

In the first place, certain stages in the development of drama from religious rites should be recognized. The ritual becomes first a dramatic ritual whenever the mimetic element is introduced. The dramatic ritual, in turn, becomes a ritualistic drama when the mimetic element overshadows the religious element. Drama develops from the ritualistic drama as soon as those concerned with its production cease to be conscious of any tradition which causes the dramatic representation to assume a certain form or employ certain themes and characters, although reminiscences of the original ritual may be plain to the investigating scholar.

Thus the reviewer cannot agree with Dr. Rudwin's idea that between "the ritual and drama, as we understand it, there yawns a mighty chasm," and that "we can have drama only when a new content has been given to the ritual." The figure of speech is rather unfortunate. Perhaps it would be better to say that between ritual and drama there is a twilight zone. Also, drama may exist when the old content of the ritual has undergone a slow development into a content which seems new but which, if analyzed, shows unmistakable traces of its origin. Certainly no chasm yawns between the Christian rituals of Easter and the highly developed French mysteries of the Passion and Resurrection. Thus the reviewer at least does not understand why Dr. Rudwin states that "the parts of the medieval drama which were based on the Church liturgy also proved incapable of dramatic evolution." Such a striking theory needs to be backed up with much evidence.

Even if Dr. Rudwin would not accept our theory of the develop-

ment of ritual into drama, had he stated his own theory by using some such terms after defining them, he would have avoided a certain amount of obscurity. For instance, one is not sure what Dr. Rudwin means by "ritual drama," although one may guess that he means "dramatic ritual." Furthermore, what is the "ritual plot" in this connection? If a ritual is dramatic enough to have a "plot," the reviewer can scarcely agree that "the ritual had but few histrionic possibilities." Indeed, the histrionic possibilities in most religious rites are the strongest foundation of the theory that drama springs from worship in a ritualistic form.

Dr. Rudwin says, "the root of the drama we will find neither in this (conflict of Spring and Winter) nor in any other incident in the ritual" (p. 24). What does he mean by the word "drama"? Does he mean conscious mimetic representation either by physical actions or sounds or both? He says elsewhere, "drama is only reached when imitation or representation extends to action" (p. 29); but since he fails to define by the word "action"—a word of many meanings as applied to drama—the statement is so obscure that the reader is not helped to understand the word "drama" in either of these passages.

Also, in regard to the influence on drama of the conflict of Spring and Winter which appears in the ritual, the reviewer is convinced that this episode produced the well-defined *agon* or combat in Attic Comedy, and that the reason there is no *agon* on the stage in early Greek tragedy is due to the fact that tragedy was not an outgrowth of this ritual.[3] The *agon* of the ritual may have had more influence on drama than Dr. Rudwin admits.

Dr. Rudwin holds the opinion that Mr. Cornford's theory of the development of Attic comedy is not tenable; but he does not offer enough evidence to convert one to his view. Mr. Cornford has shown many survivals in the Old Comedy of some of the very elements of the ritual which Dr. Rudwin discusses; and the present writer has also tried to show that Mr. Cornford's theory explains the dramatic technique of Old Comedy, while the construction of Greek tragedy shows that that form of drama cannot have developed from the same ritual.[4] Thus, when Dr. Rudwin says that "the ritual plot, above all, cannot be used for the comical drama," we

[3] D. C. Stuart, *The Origin of Greek Tragedy*, T. A. P. A., Vol. 57, p. 173.

[4] D. C. Stuart, *op. cit.*

cannot agree with his statement that Attic comedy does not show in its plot a similarity to the ritual to warrant the assumption that Attic comedy can be led back "through the folk play to the ritual procedure." Dr. Rudwin admits that the marriage which forms the canonical ending of all our comedies, may, as Cornford suggests, be "a survival of the ritual union of the sexes." But the significant part of this theory of Mr. Cornford is the fact that the marriage ends almost every extant comedy of Aristophanes in spite of the fact that, as Mr. Cornford says, "there is nothing whatever in the previous incidents of an Aristophanic plot to prepare the spectator for any such conclusion." [5] On the other hand, marriage, as a canonical ending of modern comedies, is not an outgrowth of Aristophanic comedy and hence of the marriage episode in the ritual. It is rather an outgrowth of the construction of late Greek tragedy of the Euripidean type whence it came into New Comedy, which, in turn, gave it to modern comedy.

One of Dr. Rudwin's chief reasons for rejecting Mr. Cornford's theory is that the motive of death and resurrection "would in comedy, as Mr. Cornford admits, be either too serious or too silly." In regard to the resurrection, we have already pointed out that Dr. Rudwin, accepts in spite of this statement, the episode of Æschylus' resurrection in the *Frogs* as being the result of ritualistic influence with less reserve than does Mr. Cornford himself. In regard to the death, as well as the resurrection, we still believe that Mr. Cornford has shown the influence of these ritualistic episodes in Aristophanic comedy. Mr. Cornford by no means dismisses the question of the influence of these motives on Old Comedy by his admission [6] quoted by Dr. Rudwin. On the contrary he expressly states that "if our hypothesis is sound, we might expect to find some reminiscences of the death and resurrection motive clinging to the Agones in Aristophanes." [7] He proceeds to point out these reminiscences and he concludes that "no one instance taken by itself would have much weight; but when all are taken together, and it is seen how constant this motive is, it appears to me that the probability that we have here survivals of an original simulated death of one or the other

[5] Cornford, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 75.
[7] *Loc. cit.*

adversary is considerably stronger than we should expect to find it, even if we knew on other grounds that the hypothesis were true." [8] Thus, what Mr. Cornford means by his admission is that we must not expect to find the death or resurrection of a character actually enacted in comedy, but he does believe that death and resurrection in the ritual has left its influence in comedy.

Until much stronger and more definite objections are made to Mr. Cornford's theories, we cannot admit, with Dr. Rudwin, that "the ritual plot, above all, cannot be used for comical drama," whether the German Carnival comedy used it or not. In studying drama it is always well to keep in mind the fact that there is no plot or situation inherently and unalterably tragic or comic. Whether a plot or a situation is to be tragic or comic depends upon the point of view of the playwright. Through a long period of development these serious religious rites had lost their solemnity until in Greek comedy they were burlesqued, and the very gods themselves honored by the ritual were degraded, as is Dionysus in the *Frogs*. Surely it would be hazardous to argue that, because the *Acharnians* burlesques the Dionysiac rites, Old Comedy is not derived from this very ritual. Thus, when Dr. Rudwin points out that "the motive of rejuvenation is only burlesqued in the Carnival plays," the question arises as to whether Carnival comedy has not a closer relationship to the rites to insure fertility than Dr. Rudwin admits. The reviewer finds it difficult to accept this statement as evidence that the plot of the ritual cannot be used for comedy.

We cannot help feeling that Dr. Rudwin's arguments for his thesis would have been more convincing had he not attempted to set aside Mr. Cornford's theory of the origin of Attic comedy as untenable, and if he had not attempted to use certain statements made by Mr. Cornford in support of his own views. We must remember that the germ of drama contained in similar rituals may well develop along certain dissimilar lines. For instance, a parabasis may or may not develop out of the practice of ridiculing persons in the audience, without precluding the possibility of this very custom helping to produce German Carnival comedy, although, as we have said, this phenomenon would call for some explanation.

[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 83.

If in Attica the germ of drama in this ritual developed into Aristophanic comedy, in Germanic countries it may easily develop, as Dr. Rudwin points out, only into a degenerate folk-play, whereas the actors impersonating the clownish demons—or daimons—may well have improvised certain scenes extraneous to the ritual which became the basis of the Carnival play.

Finally, perhaps many of the separate points on which the reviewer disagrees with the author would disappear, if the terminology employed by Dr. Rudwin in this interesting study were clearer. And one does not need to be overflowing with the milk of human kindness to excuse the author for vagueness. One must only have tried to write about the origin of some form of drama.

DONALD CLIVE STUART.

Princeton University.

Cyrano de Bergerac par Edmond Rostand, edited by OSCAR KUHNS and H. W. CHURCH. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1920. xiii + 255 pp.

Edmond Rostand. Cyrano de Bergerac, edited by A. G. H. SPIERS. New York: Oxford Press, 1921. xxvi + 387 pp.

There was need for a new edition of this play, always immensely popular in schools and colleges. The one brought out by Professor Kuhns in 1899 was made under the glamor of first impressions, before a general critical opinion of the play and its author had been formed and before the historical personage who furnished the salient points in the hero's character had been thoroughly studied. It served a useful purpose, but was unsatisfactory in both the introduction and the notes and lacked an essential of the successful modern text, a vocabulary. One is consequently not surprized to find that two new editions of the play have recently appeared.

The first of these contains an exact reprint of Professor Kuhn's text and introduction. Lines that contain the words *nombril* (l. 484) and *cocu* (ll. 916-923) are still omitted, despite the general decrease in prudery of the last twenty years, and we still find in 1920, as in 1899, that Rostand "is yet young; it will be interesting to watch his future career. A few more such plays as

Cyrano de Bergerac would undoubtedly stamp him as the greatest dramatic genius of the nineteenth century" (!).

Professor Church has "revised the notes and prepared the vocabulary." Of the former he has added only a score, though many more were needed, and in some of these he is clearly wrong. The *manteau d'Arlequin* (p. 177) should not be described as being "behind the curtain." Gérusez should not now be quoted as an authority (p. 178), as if Rigal had never written. "*Grise* here means 'is growing gray,' not 'gets intoxicated,' as might be inferred from the preceding line" (p. 200). *Grise,* as a matter of fact, never means 'is growing gray' and does mean 'intoxicates' with a punning reference to Father Joseph, "Son Eminence grise," as Mr. Spiers points out. Even the vocabulary, which is the only addition of any importance to the old edition, is incomplete.[1] *Coquille* should be defined as *guard,* not *hilt. Veste* does not mean *vest.* Finally, it is unfortunate that the editors have retained the old system by which lines and parts of lines are numbered as if the play were written in prose.

It is a pleasure to turn to the other edition, that of Professor Spiers. He has written an interesting introduction in which he has made use of various critical studies of Rostand and information recently obtained about Cyrano and the stage of his day. He has also endeavored to estimate for the student the value of Rostand's work, especially of his masterpiece. The text he has wisely kept without alteration. His notes are ample and carefully made. They show keen appreciation of the needs of teacher and student. He adds a special "list of proper names" in which he gives brief biographies of the various persons mentioned in the play. The vocabulary is supposed to include only the words that a student in his third or fourth year has to look up. In the main the editor has applied this principle judiciously, though I should not have made exactly the same choice.[2]

From the bibliographical list I miss M. Brun's later work on Cyrano.[3] On p. xii *la Samaritaine* should be mentioned. P. xvi,

[1] I miss *angélique, carquois, décrocher, jeu* in the sense of *pack of cards, mule, tâter.*

[2] Why exclude *escroc* and *famélique,* if one includes *esprit* and *féliciter*?

[3] *Savinien de Cyrano Bergerac. L'histoire et la légende,* Paris, Daragon, 1909.

"the musical rather than the plastic, the organic rather than the aesthetic,"—a hard saying for an undergraduate. P. 321, 1617 is not so good a date as 1620-1621 for *Pyrame*. P. 330, *Don Quichot* is a spelling found in the seventeenth century as well as in Rostand. P. 355, Mahelot's *Mémoire* shows that the scenery of the Hôtel de Bourgogne was hardly "rudimentary."

Professor Spiers describes the historical background of the characters. He knows very well that a poet is not to be taken to task for historical inaccuracies, but that it is important for a student to be told what was furnished by tradition so that he can appreciate the changes made by the poet. He does not show, however, as Brun has done, the full extent to which the romantic, idealistic Cyrano differs from his historical namesake, whose childhood is not known to have been without love, who evidenced no inclination to sacrifice himself for a rival, and who was not above seeking a patron.

In his judgment of Rostand he brings out clearly the poet's wit, cleverness, versatility, mastery of technique. He admits his lack of intellectual endowment, but does not point out his lack of sincerity, his abuse of cleverness, his *préciosité*, his *panache*. It may be that Rostand did not share the "theatrical conventions that lingered on in the dramas of Sardou, Augier and Dumas fils," but he had theatrical tricks of his own that are quite as obvious and quite as artificial. Still, the undergraduate does not notice these defects any more than an American critic who has recently declared *Cyrano* to be the greatest play since Shakespeare. Professor Spiers does not make this mistake and, if he seems too partial to Rostand, it must be remembered that a certain reverence is owing to the aesthetics of undergraduates in a book that is intended primarily for them.

H. Carrington Lancaster.

Le château d'Amour de Robert Grosseteste évêque de Lincoln, par J. Murray. Paris: Champion, 1918. 8vo. Pp. 183.

Miss Murray has done an excellent piece of work in her edition and study of the one work in French verse attributed to the great English bishop of the thirteenth century, Robert Grosseteste. The

first section is devoted to a sketch of the life and works of the author (15-21), in which Miss Murray shows she has made good use of the well-chosen books of which she gives a list in the preceding bibliography. Perhaps enough emphasis has not been given to the scholarly interests of this humanist of the thirteenth century, and to his wide and liberal tendencies, as is evidenced by the appearance of the manuscripts and translations of Hebrew books found in the monastic libraries which came within the sphere of his administration.

The very mediocre edition of the poem, due to M. Cooke, published for the Caxton Society in 1852, was based on two manuscripts; Miss Murray in the preparation of her edition has collated eleven manuscripts of the thirteenth, and fourteenth century, which contain the poem under various titles, and variant forms, to which she calls attention in detail (22-32). Of these manuscripts she has made a careful classification, of which the results, so far as the original text is concerned, are rather disconcerting, on account of the variation of readings, which have been multiplied, not only by the individual scribal peculiarities, but also by the fluctuating condition of the Anglo-French dialect as spoken and written in England in this period (32-40). Of this dialect Miss Murray has made a careful investigation with the use of the most recent work on the subject, from the metrical, phonetic, and syntactical points of view, and her results from this investigation show that the composition of the work may be assigned to the neighborhood of 1230, a date consonant with what is known of the life and works of the author (41-64). In the discussion of the sources she shows that the treatment of the Scriptures which appears in Grosseteste's theological tractates, is likewise found in the poem, as is also the emphasis given to allegorical interpretation, which is the *raison d'être* of this spiritual allegory. If she has arrived at the same conclusions as other scholars as to Grosseteste's poem being the first French poem to contain the theme of the Four Daughters of God (79), she has neither here, nor in the section on its translations and influence, assigned to it its position among other medieval works, which have undertaken to unite this episode in a single work, devoted to the story of the redemption of man, such as it is found in the poem of the St. Graal, the *Meditationes vitae Christi,* and in various passion plays (Cf. E. Roy, *Le Mystère de la Passion en France du XII^e^ au XVI^e^ siècle,*

1903, *9). And she has curiously failed to note what would seem to be the inspiration of both the title of the poem and its main theme. Dr. Neilson, twenty years ago in his well-informed dissertation on *The Origins and Sources of the Courts of Love* (1899, p. 136), which should have been in Miss Murray's bibliography, pointed out how close was the resemblance of the allegorical castle in Grosseteste's spiritual allegory to the mansion of Venus in secular allegories of an earlier, or of the same period, and how Grosseteste's interpretation had a suggestion of another type of allegory. The familiarity of the conception is further evidenced by its appearance in works of art of the same and a later period (Neilson, *op. cit.*, 137-8; R. S. Loomis, "The Allegorical Siege in the Art of the Middle Ages," *Journal of the Archaeol. Institute of America,* XXIII [1919]: 255-269; A. Rubió y Lluch, *Documents per l'historia de la Cultura catalana mieg-eval,* I [1908] 171, 193). *Le Château d'Amour* is only another instance, so common from the dawn of literature, of the adoption of a secular *genre* of literature for ecclesiastical purposes.

Neither in the section devoted to the manuscripts, nor in that devoted to the influence of the poem, has Miss Murray noted the mention of the work under various titles, in catalogues of medieval libraries. In the late fourteenth century library at Peterborough, for instance, it is noted as "Tractatus de Origine Mundi secundum Rob. Grostest, Gallice" and, again, as "Tractatus Qui in Lingua Romana secundum Robertum Grostest Episcopum Lincoln, De principio creationis mundi, de medio & fine" (S. Gunton, *The History of the Church of Peterburgh* [1687], 224, 218). Of these the first gives a title not found elsewhere, while the second includes the beginning of the Latin Prologue due to Grosseteste, himself (*ed.* 22, 23, 87), as is the case in an entry in the catalogue of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, written late in the fifteenth century: "tractatus Magistri Roberti grossi Capitis de principio mundi medio et fine in gallico" (M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* [1903], 218), while in the same catalogue (372) one finds no less than three copies listed under the title of "Tractatus domini Lincoln in gallico." We likewise find in an inventory of books which belonged to Charles V and Charles VI of France one entitled "Vie de Jhesus Crist rymée que fist saint Robert" (L. Delisle, *Recherches sur la*

Librairie de Charles V [1907], II, *77), as in the rubric of Ms. L (26). If no one of a number of such entries can be identified with any one of the manuscripts on which this edition is based, these entries at least show the popularity of the work under various titles.

The editor has presented a readable text, with the supplement of a long list of variants, which can still be used to advantage, in suggesting more probable readings than those adopted. What advantage for instance has the suggested reading based on the reading "Iny" in one manuscript:

En li conuisse sanz folage (24),

over that found in all the other manuscripts which read:

Le conuisse sanz folage?

And how would the emended text be translated? In Old French, "soi conoistre en" is a not unknown construction, but is "li" to be taken as the tonic form of the third personal pronoun in the plural? Is "O ez, seignurs" (43) a mere misprint for the Anglo-Norman "oez"? The sudden change from the singular to the plural form in the line:

Meis tu primes le enfreinsistes"

is certainly worthy of comment, supported as it is by the majority of manuscripts, as a striking example, and in a most emphatic way of a phenomenon of which cases abound not only in Old French, but also in a number of Germanic languages, including English (Cf. F. Liebrecht, *Glossaire du Chevalier au Cygne* [1859], 440, *Gött. gel. Anz.* [1866], 1038; [1870], 1232, [1871], 1922; *Academy,* III, 202).

The short glossary (181-2) is perhaps not as complete as it should be, while giving some unnecessary explanations. Does "projectile," with which *quarel* is glossed, give any clue to its very common meaning: "the bolt of a cross-bow"? Neither in the glossary nor in the notes has attention been called to the identical Anglo-Norman form for two words, "*poür*" (1526) "fear" for O. F. *paour,* Lat. pavor, and "*poür*" (1620), "stench," Lat. *putor,* Prov. *pudor,* O. F. *puor.* In the second place, in the poem the pains of hell are enumerated of which:

E la tierce si iert poür,

an equation with the *fetor* if in a different order, of the *Vision of*

St. Paul, which the editor has occasion to cite, 179; (Cf. P. Meyer, *Rom.,* XXIV, 366; cf. 360, n. 1).

In her notes Miss Murray adds much to the elucidation of the text by the citations she gives of scholastic and legal texts. But is the extra-Scriptural information that Adam was created in the valley of Hebron (75-6) so well known that it was not worth citing some medieval texts? (Cf. A. Bovenschen, *Die Quellen f. d. Reisebeschreibung des Johann von Mandeville* [1888], 37), and is the proper name "Architriclin" (1247) as well known to the average reader as to a medieval reader, or auditor, so that a note on its origin in the word in the Vulgate "architriclinus" (*John,* II, 8-9), for the master of the feast, is not necessary? (Cf. F. Michel, *Tristan,* II, 310; Villon, *Grant Testament,* 1243, E. Langlois, *Table des Noms propres . . . dans les Chansons de Geste* [1904], 45, *Mandeville's Travels, edited from MS. Cotton Titus C. XVI in the British Museum,* ed. P. Hamelius (Publ. E. E. T. 153) [1919], 153. The passage is not found in Halliwell's text, p. 111, and so its source has not been noted by Bovenschen, *op. cit.,* 57).

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

Cornell University.

CORRESPONDENCE

A POSTLIMINEAR COROLLARIUM FOR CORYATE

Having recently been led by Mr. Maurice Hewlett's *A Fool of Quality* to read Tom Coryate's *Crudities* for the first time, I am moved by my surprise, not to say indignation, to attempt a *Rettung.* Mr. Hewlett's entertaining skit portrays Coryate as a buffoon and a butt, who must have sat for Shakespeare's fools. And the *Cambridge History of English Literature,* if it does not confirm, would do little to correct this impression. Mr. Hewlett quotes what is almost the only absurd, but is unfortunately the first, sentence in Coryate's book, with the comment, "Shakespere can never have missed such a man as that." To prove that Coryate was "a euphuist of the first water" and a fool Mr. Hewlett and others instance his title-pages, which are no more affected than those of Chapman, Purchas, or Raleigh, and three or four intentionally extravagant sentences, some of them from private letters. They do not tell the reader that almost the whole of Coryate's

instructive book is written in a plain, simple, manly narrative style. And they do not appear to understand the playful pedantries which seem so ridiculous to them. The "Pancraticall and athletical health," of which Coryate boasts in a letter from the East, is a then-familiar quotation from Plautus (*valet pancratice atque athletice*). The "Cramb and twice-sodden Colwort" of the title-page of his second book is merely an allusion to the Greek proverb, δὶς κράμβη θάνατος, more familiar in Juvenal's

Occidit miseros crambe repetita magistros.

It is not true that at every stage of his journey "he is careful to give you the mileage from his own door." He gives it at the end, as many modern travellers do. Why not? His preference of Odcombe to all other cities, is usually expressed in the facetious tone of Oliver Wendell Holmes' glorification of the Hub. The statement which Mr. Hewlett finds so funny, that "Odcombe . . . is so dear unto me that I preferre the very smoak thereof before the fire of all other places under the sunne," is a pretty allusion to Odysseus ἰέμενος καὶ καπνόν, or Ovid's, *fumum de patriis posse videre focis.* And the "provinciality" is neither more or less than that of Andrew Lang's dithyramb in justification of his preference of St. Andrews to all the world.

These harmless pedantries of classical quotation and allusion were the fashion then, and were doubtless less offensive to the circle of Ben Jonson than they would be to the editorial staff of the *New Republic.*

I am not sustaining the paradox that there was no fire behind all this smoke. There was obviously a touch of Boswellian fatuity in Coryate, and he may not have known how to behave at court. But his scholarship (though he modestly disclaims scholarship, he spoke and wrote tolerable Greek and Latin), his common sense, his lively intellectual curiosity and his human kindliness are grossly misrepresented when he is stigmatized as a court fool. The pompous euphuism of his addresses to King James and Prince Henry signifies little. Very estimable writers, from Isocrates to Themistius, and from the Emperor Julian to Tennyson, have addressed reigning monarchs in language that will not bear the scrutiny of a free posterity. King James may or may not have said, "Is that fool yet living?" I like not the security. The worst things that the condescending report of the Rev. Edward Terry, Chaplain to the Lord Ambassador to the Great Mogul, has to say of him are, that he had a thirst for fame, "that he was a man of a very coveting eye that could never be satisfied with seeing," and that "if he had not fallen into the smart hands of the wits of those times he might have fared better." It is true that the wits seem to have had what modern reporters would call 'a follow on Tom.' But it would require a more discriminating

and a longer criticism than I have space for to determine how many of the jocose poetical epistles of commendation published with his book were intended as gibes, and how many expressed genuine affection. For he was clearly, whatever his foibles, a jolly good fellow, and a lovable man. A friend aptly quotes of him Publilius Syrus' saying,

Comes facundus in via pro vehiculo.

Paul Shorey.

University of Chicago.

Pierre Bayle and His Biographers

There has already appeared in *M. L. N.*[1] a note relative to the work of one of Pierre Bayle's recent biographers, A. Cazes.[2] Aside from passages found in his work which reveal identity with A. Lenient's *Etude sur Bayle,* it may also be added that Cazes' information on the Rotterdam critic and philosopher is at times at fault as shown in his chapter devoted to the life of Bayle.

Page 4: Bayle's younger brother Joseph is called Du Perrot, though his name is given as Du Peyrat in Desmaizeaux (Cf. *Vie de Bayle, Dict. Crit.,*[3] I, p. xvii). P. 5: Bayle is said to have been sent in his youth to one of his relatives, M. Bayze, a Protestant minister at Saverdun who had "une immense bibliothèque." Bayle was, indeed, related to Bayze, but, as a matter of fact, the minister referred to with a large library was M. Rival (Cf. *Vie de Bayle,* p. xvii). P. 5: "Rentré au Carla, il y passa des mois de convalescence." On the other hand Desmaizeaux states: "Lorsqu'il fut tout à fait rétabli il retourna au Carla" (Cf. *Vie de Bayle,* p. xvii). P. 11: In his *Critique générale de l'Histoire du Calvinisme* Bayle did not write 29 letters as indicated but 30. In 1685 he wrote 22 more. There appeared 52 letters in all (Cf. *Œuvres diverses,* Vol. II). P. 12: Cazes states that: "La sœur de Jurieu voulut marier Bayle avec Mlle Dumoulin." It is not quite so. Mademoiselle Jurieu mentioned in Desmaizeaux was Jurieu's wife and not his sister, and Mlle Dumoulin was her sister who later married Basnage, Bayle's friend. The title "Mademoiselle" was also given to a married woman whose husband was not of noble birth. Mlle Dumoulin was not the intended one, as is said, but, in truth, did her utmost to bring about the marriage for the benefit of one of her friends (Cf. *Œuvres,* IV, *Lettre de Mlle Dumoulin,* 12 décembre 1682). P. 17: The wording "Au début de 1689 parut la Réponse d'un nouveau Converti bientôt suivie des Réflexions sur les

[1] *Bayle and his Biographers,* Horatio E. Smith, XXVII, 158.

[2] A. Cazes, *Pierre Bayle,* Dujarric et Cie, Paris, 1905.

[3] Pierre Bayle, *Œuvres diverses* and *Dictionnaire Critique,* 1737 edition.

Guerres civiles des Protestants" is misleading. The latter work is in fact the title of a chapter forming part of the *Réponse etc.* The whole appeared early in 1689 (Cf. *Réponse d'un nouveau Converti, Œuvres,* II, 541 and 552). P. 18: Cazes quotes part of a letter of Bayle to his cousin de Naudis: "Vous serez cent fois meilleur réformé, si vous ne voyez notre religion qu'où elle est persécutée." The date of this letter is 1693 and not 1691 as erroneously stated. This quotation is taken directly from Desmaizeaux's *Vie de Bayle,* but the wording of this letter as found in Bayle's *Œuvres* is at variance and reads: "Vous serez une fois meilleur réformé si vous ne voyez notre religion que dans les païs où elle n'est pas sur le trône." Which reading is correct? (Cf. *Œuvres,* Vol. I, *Lettres à sa Famille,* p. 170.) P. 19: Commenting upon the verdict of the Consistory of the Walloon Church of Rotterdam concerning Bayle's attacks on Jurieu, Cazes says: "Bayle protesta de la droiture de ses intentions et Jurieu fut invité à plus de modération à l'égard de son adversaire." The Consistory's decision differs slightly. The minutes of the meetings indicate that Jurieu had been treated by Bayle very badly, and Bayle and not Jurieu was urged "à se conduire à l'avenir avec plus de modération tant dans la seconde édition de son Dictionnaire que dans les autres volumes qu'il promet au public" (Cf. *Actes du Consistoire de Rotterdam, Dict. crit.,* I, p. cxix).

While the first part of A. Cazes' work on Pierre Bayle should, therefore, be consulted with caution, due recognition must be made of the fact that the second part, which contains selections from Bayle's *Œuvres* is still of value and service.

HENRY E. HAXO.

University of North Dakota.

SYLVESTRE BONNARD AND PHILETAS

What had Sylvestre Bonnard been reading when there appeared to him, "a man without imagination," the fairy perched on the *Chronique de Nurenberg?* Surely the medieval nymphs and their portraits in old manuscripts were present to his memory. His fairy's dress might have come straight from some richly illumined parchment, but what medieval elf ever spoke as she? The author's fancy is bred in other traditions and Anatole France is better read in classic than in medieval literature. His Sylvestre Bonnard is no mean classical scholar. We may perhaps ask whether he had not in mind a pretty anacreontic motif in *Daphnis and Chloe.* In the second book of that famous story an old shepherd, Philetas, tells how he found in his garden and pursued in vain a tiny marauder. Wearied at last he leans on his staff while the intruder smiles and throws myrtle seeds at him, much as the nymph pelted Sylvestre's

nose with hazel nut shells. The old scholar reflects that "tout est permis aux dames et que tout ce qui vient d'elles est grâce et faveur" and addresses a learned compliment to the impertinent imp. Philetas feels his heart "amolli et attendri" and swears by all that he holds dear that the infant robber may have the liberty of the garden in exchange for a kiss. "Et adonc se prenant à rire avec une chère gaie, et bonne et gentille grâce, m'a jeté une voix si aimable et si douce, que ni l'arondelle, ni le rossignol, ni le cygne, fût-il aussi vieux que je suis, n'en saurait jeter de pareille, disant: Quant à moi, Philétas, ce ne serait pas la peine de te baiser; car j'aime plus être baisé que tu ne désires, toi, retourner dans ta jeunesse: mais garde que ce que tu me demandes ne soit un don mal séant et peu convenable à ton âge, pource que ta vieillesse ne t'exemptera point de me vouloir poursuivre, quand tu m'auras une fois baisé; et n'y a aigle ni faucon, ni autre oiseau de proie, tant ait-il l'aile vite et légère, qui me pût atteindre. Je ne suis point enfant, combien que j'en aie l'apparence; mais suis plus ancien que Saturne, plus ancient même que tout le temps. Je te connais dès lors qu'étant en la fleur de ton âge, tu gardais en ce prochain pâtis un si beau et gras troupeau de vaches, et étais près de toi quand tu jouais de la flûte sous ces hêtres, amoureux d'Amaryllide. Mais tu ne me voyais pas, encore que je fusse avec ton amie . . . et pour le présent je gouverne Daphnis et Chloé. . . . Je me lave en ces fontaines, qui est cause que toutes les plantes et les fleurs de ton jardin sont si belles à voir, pour ce que mon bain les arrose . . . répute-toi bien heureux de ce que toi seul entre les hommes, dans ta vieillesse, tu es encore bien voulu de cet enfant." And Philetas, explaining his vision, says: "Amour . . . est jeune, beau, a des ailes; pourquoi il se plaît avec la jeunesse, cherche la beauté et ravit les âmes, ayant plus de pouvoir que Jupiter même. Il règne sur les astres, sur les éléments, gouverne le monde, et conduit les autres Dieux comme vous avec la houlette menez vos chèvres et brebis. Les fleurs sont ouvrage d'Amour; les plantes et les arbres sont de sa facture; c'est par lui que les rivières coulent, et que les vents soufflent."[1]—Sylvestre congratulates his fairy on her judgment in appearing to an elderly scholar who knows the history of her race but she answers: "Le plus petit des marmots qui vont par les chemins avec un pan de chemise à la fente de leur culotte me connaît mieux que tous les gens à lunettes de vos Instituts et de vos Académies. . . . Je charme le monde; je suis partout, sur un rayon de lune, dans le frisson d'une source cachée, dans le feuillage mouvant qui chante, dans les blanches vapeurs qui montent, chaque matin, du creux des prairies, au milieu des bruyères roses partout!" And finally, although Sylvestre's fairy is not Cupidon, no one perhaps has ever given a better definition of Love: "On me rêve et je parais!"

[1] *Daphnis et Chloé*, édition Nilsson, Paris, s. d. pp. 71 et suiv.

I have quoted at length, not to show any direct borrowing, for surely there is none, but to make clear the kinship of imagination. In spite of her dress and the folk-lore tricks that Sylvestre attributes to his visitor, she is an evocation from Alexandrian rather than from medieval literature.

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE.

University of Texas.

AN IMPROMPTU OF VOLTAIRE COMPLETED

In the *Œuvres de Voltaire* (Edition Moland, vol. x, p. 477) is printed an *Impromptu* of four lines, to which the date of 1720 has been assigned: *Impromptu à Mademoiselle de Charolois peinte en habit de Cordelier.* A foot-note of the editor refers to the existence of a second version of this small poem: "M. de Voltaire, sachant qu'on chantait ces vers sur l' air de Robin Turelure, y ajouta, dit-on, d' autres couplets fort plaisants." I have found these additions by Voltaire in a manuscript of about 1734 in my possession: *Receuil de plusieurs Piesse* (sic), p. 501:

Frère Ange de Charolois
Par une rare avanture
Au cordon de St. François, turelure,
De Vénus joint la ceinture, Robin turelure.

S'il étoit aux Cordeliers
Moine de cette encolure
J'irais demain des premiers, turelure,
Chez eux briguer la tonsure, Robin turelure.

Avec un frère si beau,
Fut on couché sur la dure,
L'on passeroit à gogo, turelure,
Ses beaux ans dans la clôture, Robin turelure.

GUST. L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

University of Minnesota.

A NOTE ON *The Scarlet Letter*

Was it a matter of deliberate and delicate design on Hawthorne's part that the action of *The Scarlet Letter* covers *seven* years, seeing that Hester Prynne and Arthur Dimmesdale broke the *seventh* commandment? With Chapter XI—"The Interior of a Heart," wherein the author, in so many words, lets us into the secret of the story—approximately seven years have passed. After this chapter, the phrase *seven years* occurs with the insistency of a refrain, appearing seventeen times from Chapter XII to Chapter XXIII. In the third person the phrase is used once with reference to the scaffold, and elsewhere with reference to Pearl, Chilling-

worth, and Hester. When put into the mouths of the characters, the phrase is used only by Hester and Dimmesdale. Such designed coincidence—the "seven years of outlaw and ignominy" matching by number the law broken by "the pastor and his parishioner"—without any comment by the author showing that he was aware of it, would be quite natural to the subtle simplicity of Hawthorne.

E. C. Ross.

Miami University.

BRIEF MENTION

A Study of Metre, by T. S. Omond (Reprinted from the first edition. London: Alexander Moring, The De La More Press, 1920). The Introductory note to the first edition of this work was dated January, 1903. After the interval of almost two decades the author resubmits his volume to the public with no changes "beyond trifling verbal corrections, . . . feeling that a book once issued is the property of the public." But the critical press attests the fact that the interval has for him not been one of idleness in respect of his devotion to the study of English prosody. Besides he has recently recast and brought "down to date" his *English Metrists* (Clarendon Press, 1921). The writer of this notice also takes pleasure in the acknowledgment that thru an interchange of letters he has been gratified by Mr. Omond's gentle, earnest, and fair-minded attitude to his colleagues in the study of his favorite subject. So scrupulous is Mr. Omond, with no aversion to readjustments of his convictions, that one cannot quarrel with him for a persistent and confident advocacy of judgments at which he has arrived thru honest endeavor. His is not the spirit of the intransigent. He rather seems to give to his positive statements the air of an invitation to carry the discussion into closer approximation of the complete truth. If, in the following paragraphs, necessary brevity will induce a somewhat absolute form of expression, Mr. Omond will be least inclined to misinterpret the manner.

Is the subject of English versification then one that has the connotations of a quarrel? It is. This is because an historical subject is prevailingly treated in an unhistorical manner; the evidence of centuries is disregarded, and the argument is based on subjective and vaguely preferred impressions, or on extemporized life-long convictions. In an analogous way, popular etymologies take a strong hold on the untrained mind, which is not easily persuaded that the plain meaning of Welsh Rare-bit is really no meaning at all. It would be gratifying to find Mr. Omond following the historical method. His recognition of accent as the *ictus metricus* would have taken on its complete meaning in the light of an historical consideration of the principles of English accentuation. Moreover, in that light the following statements

would have been greatly altered: "Milton's blank verse normally carries five accents, yet all critics [Is this true?] agree that there are lines in *Paradise Lost* with only four. How do such lines remain metrical? They remain so because each line consists of five periods, though in the case assumed not every period is signalized by accent. Periodicity is the essential quality, accentuation its usual but not invariable exponent" (p. 24). But for every line of 'only four' stresses the established list of accents available for stress would supply the required fifth stress.

The structural foot (or 'period' as Mr. Omond prefers to call it) is always marked off by some historically valid sort of accent functioning as stress (ictus). The accents available for this office are various. This is made plain in Bright and Miller's *Elements of English Versification* (BM.). But metrists, including Mr. Omond, are slow to learn the lesson thoroly. When, for example, in one of his letters to the press, Mr. Omond cites the line from Pope, "Or garden, tempting with forbidden fruit," and declares that "no grown person lays much stress on *with*," he may be asked what he means by "much stress." He cannot mean 'no stress'; and if by stress he means ictus, as he should do, he admits the required ictus. And it is the valid ictus of relational words (BM. § 47). This is a concession to 'routine scansion,' which, in another detached letter to the press (*The Times*, Lit. Sup. March 2, 1921), he recognizes as "the primary basis of metre," and adds "that we never can get altogether away from it." In this instance he is brought to admit the available stress of relational words, but merely as means for holding up the form, by not agreeing with Ruskin's parents in their disapproval of the child's (Ruskin's) recital of

> Shall any following spring revive
> The ashes *of* the urn

He would not have this stress exaggerated in a childish fashion. No one would. But the child has put the stress, tho it may wrongly be "much stress," at the right place.

In the letter just cited, Mr. Omond shows a wavering in judgment that would be corrected by a less trammeled observation of poetic conventions and by a perception of the inherent character and availability for ictus of the secondary word-accents. It is asked whether in the same line a word can show a variation of stress, as in "A *divine* presence in a place *divine*." The poets say it is admissible and produces admirable effects. Then "a crucial instance" is taken from Shelley: "I love all that thou *lovest*" (riming with *drest*). The comment runs: it is reported that the poetess Mme. Declaux "distinctly said *lovést*. Those who read . . . *lóvest* are simply shirking the difficulty. The question is evidently not one to be settled offhand, and readers may be left to consider

it for themselves, recalling further examples, which are easily found." But the question is definitely answered by the "easily found" examples (BM. p. 64). A theory must of course stand the test of 'crucial instances.'

A verse is a succession of syllables, which, like a gimp cord, has a sustaining wire running thru it. The wire carries the pulsations of stress according to both the plainer and the more subtle sense-accent of the syllables, and so keeps the verse running true to the rhythm-signature. The metrist must agree with the poet in perceiving that in versification the language is under the dominion of an art that is not the art of prose-utterance. The more subtle accents, maintained thru centuries but always in prose subject to neglect, except when called up in some exigency of accentuation, these in verse are lifted into the function of stress as the poet's rhetoric of sense may require. Briefly that is the whole story, but to understand the full force of the statement one must undergo the discipline of training in the long but consistent history of the principles of English accentuation. No other basis will sustain a sound theory of the conventionalities of versification, as they have been observed thru centuries.

The present notice of Mr. Omond's reprinted treatise shall be restricted to a questioning of his fundamental contention. That this questioning is implied in what already has been stated will be perceived when it is observed that Mr. Omond builds his theory upon the assumption that the structural unit (the foot) is a time-unit. He accordingly scans by a subjective division of a verse into its "time-spaces or periods of duration, in which the syllables are, as it were, embedded." This involves a disregard of the historic stress-permissibilities of the language and of the finer sense-rhetoric of poetry, and leads to an admission of pauses that renders his theory unfruitful of a codification of the undeniably simple rules for the making of a normally rhythmic verse. Accentuation in its complete range of degrees provides for the equal time-units, and is therefore the primary factor in English versification.

Mr. Omond misunderstands or rather misinterprets scansion according to rhythm-signature, which is also called routine-scansion. To him the method is an artificial or mechanical syllable-counting. Now, routine-scansion has its analogue in reading a musical composition, in which there is a note-counting, but under the law of the regular recurrence of the 'beats.' Pauses are, of course, used structurally in both 'notations,' so too the resolution of the 'note' whether under the stress or in the 'thesis.' But the regular recurrence of the 'beat' must be maintained in both arts, and the 'beats' must fall at regular intervals of time. This is the structural fact in versification, and it is not invalidated by that class of pauses "voluntary and optional" that may be made in reading a verse. Mr. Omond says rightly of these pauses: "one reader

makes them and another leaves them out; the same reader will vary them at different times. These surely cannot be parts of structure" (p. 7).

One might have expected Mr. Omond's excellent report, with discerning comments, of the experiments made in the imitation of classic versification (*English Metrists,* chap. I) to have shown him that the subtle laws of accentuation are to be primarily justified in the marking off of the "isochronous periods" of English rhythm. Moreover, he is surprisingly confident in contending for the novelty of his contention that rhythm moves with isochronous steps. But is this not universally taken for granted, and often enough plainly stated, that verse-rhythm responds to the beat of the baton? Notice, for example, Gayley and Young's *English Poetry, its Principles and Progress* (1904, latest impression 1908), Introd. § 7: "The recurrence of identity at regular time or space intervals which pleases us when it characterizes thought and natural movements and forms, . . . the poet attempts to represent in the materials of language. . . . we note that the rhythm regularly ascends to the stress; and that the syllables capable of receiving accent [should be 'stress'] have been ordered so that each is separated from the next by a light or unstressed syllable" (referring to the chosen example in iambic measure). And this from BM. § 4: "But the term 'rhythmic motion' is also applied to sensations of hearing. . . . Measured rhythm underlies the art of versification as well as the art of music. A verse is so constructed that its beats, or verse-stresses, fall at regular intervals of time, dividing the verse into equal time-units."

J. W. B.

The Dramatic Associations of the Easter Sepulchre. By Karl Young (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 10. Madison, 1920). This study, despite its somewhat misleading title, is chiefly devoted to a consideration of the two medieval observances of Good Friday and Easter Sunday known as the *Depositio* and *Elevatio,* respectively. A number of texts are printed for the first time and the origins of the ceremonies as well as their relation to the *Visitatio Sepulchri* are investigated.

Professor Young connects the *Depositio Hostiae* with the custom of reserving the host consecrated on Holy Thursday for the Missa Praesanctificatorum of Good Friday in some sort of receptacle associated with the idea of burial. He traces the laying down of a cross, with or without the host, to the influence of the *Adoratio Crucis,* one of the oldest observances of Holy Week. The *Elevatio* is regarded as a natural sequel to the *Depositio.*

Whether the use of the host preceded that of the cross in these ceremonies, or vice versa, we are not told, but the order adopted

in the discussion is followed in printing the texts, that is, the ceremonies involving the use of the host precede those in which the cross is used. Since it has hitherto been quite generally assumed, especially in view of the close connection between the *Adoratio* and the *Depositio* (cf. Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage,* II, 21) that the burying of a cross antedates that of a host, some discussion of this point would have been welcome.

The chronological relations between the *Depositio-Elevatio,* the Easter sepulchre, and the *Visitatio* are somewhat more fully indicated. According to the author, the *Depositio* and *Elevatio* apparently arose in the tenth century and became associated with a *sepulchrum* which "was already at hand for adoption" (p. 127). Altho these ceremonies, like the *Visitatio,* are extra-liturgical, nevertheless, unlike it, they are completely liturgical in content, and impersonation never took place in them. In other words, whatever the *Depositio* and *Elevatio* may indirectly have contributed to the medieval stage, they themselves never became true drama. From these facts it is plausibly inferred that the *Visitatio* which, also during the tenth century, was brought into connection with the sepulchre, is a later development than the more stereotyped *Depositio* and *Elevatio.*

The value of this study lies less in its conclusions—most of which indeed had been anticipated by Chambers—than in its systematic presentation of new as well as old material and its re-investigation of the subject in the light of this presentation. Professor Young never allows himself to be tempted into making premature generalizations. One cannot refrain from hoping, therefore, that he may presently give us a history of the liturgical drama as a whole which will summarize and correlate the results of his many important contributions in this field.

G. F.

The Captives; or The Lost Recovered. By Thomas Heywood. Edited by Alexander Corbin Judson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921), renders generally accessible another of the plays that have for nearly forty years been locked up, out of reach of all students save those who are near the larger libraries, in one of the volumes of the late A. H. Bullen's *Collection of Old English Plays,* 1885. Last year I welcomed the reprint (by the Princeton University Press) of another of Bullen's plays: *Charlemagne,* edited by Professor Schoell; and it is a pleasure to welcome now this companion volume. The play is printed from the contemporary manuscript copy in Egerton Ms. 1994, in the British Museum. Professor Judson has used rotographs of the manuscript and has been able to correct a number of misreadings that crept into Bullen's text. More than that, he is able to furnish con-

vincing proofs of the fact that had previously been suspected by the authorities of the Museum; namely, that the manuscript is a holograph of Thomas Heywood himself, with a number of corrections and additions in a later handwriting. With regard to sources he has no absolutely new facts to add. The main plot derives from Plautus' *Rudens;* the extent of Heywood's indebtedness, often going so far as close verbal copying, is indicated in the notes. Professor Judson has in this part of his work made use of the researches of Allan H. Gilbert ("Thomas Heywood's Debt to Plautus," *Jour. Eng. and Germ. Phil.* XII). Mr. Bullen was not able to indicate the source of the curious farcical and *macabre* sub-plot of the murdered friar. In 1898 Professor Kittredge printed a note on this subject, pointing out that the underplot was a version of the Old French *fabliau* of "Le Prêtre qu'on porte." It was not noted at the time and it has remained to be noted by Professor Judson that two years earlier, in 1896, Professor Koeppel had indicated (in *Archiv,* XCVII) the precise source, a *novella* by Masuccio di Salerno, of which the French *fabliau* and the English "Merry Jest of Dan Hew of Leicestre" are quite similar versions.—The volume is of very pleasing appearance and is admirably printed; I have noted no error save "Dr. A. H. Ward" for "A. W. Ward" (p. 14).

S. C. C.

Lanson's *Manuel bibliographique de la littérature française moderne* needs no description in these columns. From the time of its first appearance it has been an indispensable aid in study and investigation. We now welcome with keen interest the new edition which has just appeared ("Nouvelle édition, revue et augmentée," Paris, Hachette, 1921, xxxii + 1820 pp.). Like the preceding edition, it is issued in five separate parts, and also in a single volume (80 francs). The first three parts are a reprint of the 1914 issue. Part 4 (Nineteenth Century) contains at the end an additional section of ten pages (1526-36) on war-literature. Part 5 is made up of the Supplement and the Index. The supplement, already present in 1914, has been revised and expanded: many items which had previously been overlooked or which belong to the period since the last edition have been added, so that instead of 130 pages the supplement now requires 202 pages. The index has been revised to include this new material.

Those who wish to bring their old edition up to date can do so by obtaining Part 4 (30 fr.) and Part 5 (15 fr.), or, if they do not require the section on war-literature, by adding to their present volume only Part 5. Libraries would do well to purchase the complete new edition.

E. C. A.

65

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVII FEBRUARY, 1922 NUMBER 2

SHAKESPEARE'S MANIPULATION OF HIS SOURCES IN *AS YOU LIKE IT*

Nothing is more characteristic of Shakespeare than his ability to discern the dramatic possibilities of a story or a portion of history, and his skill in transforming such material into a fully developed, unified, thrilling drama. Says Professor ten Brink:

"Seldom or never can the literary artist use his material in just the form in which it presents itself to him; for almost never does it correspond completely to the idea which he either recognizes in it or imparts to it. Therefore the Poet exercises his right to transform the fable in accordance with his purpose, that is, into agreement with his own idea. . . . The deeper, the clearer, the more powerful and complete the nature, the personality of the poet is, so much more successful will be the gradual shaping, the refashioning of his fable. An unrivalled master in this field, far more than in the field of composition, is Shakespeare; his greatness displays itself most of all in the infallible intuition with which he feels his way to the tragic [dramatic] elements of a story and brings these forth to complete dramatic expression." [1]

An excellent illustration of Shakespeare's manipulation of a borrowed story is offered if we compare the comedy *As You Like It* with its principal source, the euphuistic pastoral romance of Thomas Lodge, *Rosalynde,* which appeared in 1590. The very closeness with which the dramatist follows his original, forces upon our attention the great value of his changes, even when they are but slight. At every turn, rejoicing over some small addition, some slight omission, or some minor change, we find ourselves saying with Browning:

[1] Translated from a pamphlet, *Über die Aufgabe der Litteraturgeschichte,* Strassburg, 1891, pp. 18-19.

> Oh, the little more, and how much it is!
> And the little less, and what worlds away!

Since a detailed comparison of the play and Lodge's story has been made by others,[2] I shall call attention only to the larger features. In some cases I shall use only Shakespeare's names for the characters.

All the important lines of action in the play are taken from Lodge. The enmity between the Dukes, the quarrel between Orlando and Oliver, the love-affairs of Orlando and Rosalind, of Oliver and Celia, of Silvius and Phebe, are all borrowed.

Let us glance at a few striking differences between the source and the play. Shakespeare cuts off years of time at the outset of the story, beginning with the quarrel between Orlando and his brother. He presents a single, definite quarrel and its results, while in Lodge there are three outbreaks of hostility between the brothers, the first two being followed by feigned reconciliations. In Lodge, Rosader (Orlando), though the younger son, is his father's favorite, and receives a larger share of the property than either of his brothers. Shakespeare suppresses this partial justification for the envy of Oliver. In Shakespeare, Duke Frederick and the banished Duke Senior are brothers. The corresponding characters in Lodge are nowhere said to be brothers, and we do not see how the intimacy between Rosalind and Alinda (Celia) was brought about.

In Lodge, the usurping King banishes Rosalynde, and then in a fit of anger because his daughter defends Rosalynde against his unjust accusations, banishes his daughter also. In Shakespeare, Celia's unselfish devotion to Rosalind and her voluntary decision to go into banishment with her cousin, are attractive elements in the story, and the search for the missing Celia is used to advance the plot. Because of a suspicion that Orlando has helped to spirit off the missing girls, a demand is made upon Oliver that he produce his brother. Thus Oliver finds his own fate bound up with that of Orlando.

[2] Delius, N. "Lodge's Rosalynde und Shakspere's As You Like It," *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, VI (1871), 226-49.

Stone, W. G. "Shakspere's *As You Like It* and Lodge's *Rosalynde* Compared," *Transactions New Shakspere Soc.*, 1880-85, Part II, 277-93, 25*, 31*.

Orlando decides for himself to wrestle with Charles. In Lodge, much less effectively, Saladyne (Oliver) suggests to his brother that he take part either in the tournament at court or in the wrestling match. The attempt of Rosalind and Celia to dissuade Orlando from the wrestling is new to Shakespeare. This shows them in a pleasing way, and gives a natural opportunity for Rosalind and Orlando to see something of each other. The new feature that Orlando's father when living was a warm friend of Rosalind's father, and that Duke Frederick is unfriendly to Orlando for this reason, makes Rosalind's kindness to the young wrestler natural and maidenly. She is somewhat bold at this point in Lodge's story.

The play shows good taste in giving Rosalind as Ganymede the rôle of brother to Aliena; in the story she is Aliena's page. In Lodge, Rosader (Orlando), when lost in the forest of Arden, becomes faint and discouraged, but is cheered and roused up by the aged Adam. Shakespeare makes Orlando play the man throughout.

In the story, Rosader (Orlando) lets the banished girls wander off to Arden and makes no attempt to serve them. When he himself reaches Arden and meets Gerismond (Duke Senior), he informs that exiled monarch that his daughter and her dear friend Alinda (Celia) have been banished from court. This fact makes frankly incredible the failure afterward of both Rosader and Gerismond to recognize Rosalynde. The absence of recognition is difficult enough in the play, but at least Orlando and Duke Senior know nothing of the banishment of the girls, and never dream that they can be in Arden.

I shall not compare in detail the story and the play. Delius and Stone have done this with thoroughness and discrimination. My special purpose at this point is to ask whether any of Shakespeare's departures from Lodge's form of the story, or omissions of material there found, are of doubtful value or even unwise. This question has not been frankly considered. It is easier to endorse and praise the great dramatist. But Shakespeare does not greatly need our endorsement.

In Lodge, just after Rosader (Orlando) has read his elaborate poem describing the beauty of Rosalind, we have the following bright bit of fencing of which the play makes no use:

"Believe me," quoth Ganymede, "either the forester is an exquisite painter, or Rosalynde far above wonder; so it makes me blush to hear how women should be so excellent, and pages so unperfect."

Rosader beholding her earnestly, answered thus:

"Truly, gentle page, thou hast cause to complain thee wert thou the substance, but resembling the shadow content thyself; for it is excellence enough to be like the excellence of nature."

"He hath answered you, Ganymede," quoth Aliena, "it is enough for pages to wait on beautiful ladies, and not to be beautiful themselves."

"O mistress," quoth Ganymede, "hold your peace, for you are partial. Who knows not but that all women have desire to tie sovereignty to their petticoats, and ascribe beauty to themselves, where, if boys might put on their garments, perhaps they would prove as comely; if not as comely, it may be more courteous."[3]

Rosalynde-Ganymede plays with reality here in a fascinating way. It seems as if Shakespeare might well have borrowed some of this daring irony.

Having determined that everything in this play shall be 'as you like it,' Shakespeare cannot follow Lodge in making the usurping King meet death in battle, fighting to retain his ill-gotten dominion. Instead of this, the usurper in Shakespeare, coming at the head of a troop to put his good brother to the sword, meets "an old religious man," and "after some question with him" is converted "both from his enterprise and from the world." He becomes a religious recluse and bequeaths the crown "to his banished brother." There has been no adequate preparation for this easy solution. This turn of affairs is really absurd, the high-water mark of extravagant romanticism in the entire play.

Does not Shakespeare make a decided mistake in dropping Adam out of the play as soon as Orlando and he are welcomed to the forest by Duke Senior? In Lodge, Adam rejoices at the later reconciliation between the estranged brothers Rosader and Saladyne (Orlando and Oliver), and his rejoicing would have added a pleasing element to the play. In the romance, Adam is also remembered and rewarded at the close. Delius may well be right in saying that the old man is crowded out because Shakespeare has so many lines

[3] Baldwin's ed. of *Rosalynde*, Ginn, pp. 56-57; Furness' ed. of *As You Like It*, pp. 348-49.

of action to follow. We shall soon see also that Shakespeare has added two farther lines of interest to the five stories which he took over from the prose romance. But is not this failure to keep the faithful Adam in mind an example of a trait which Shakespeare displays elsewhere, an inability to appreciate the power with which he has made a character appeal to us? In similar fashion, there is no mention of the faithful Fool at the close of *King Lear,* and the high-hearted boy Mamillius is forgotten at the close of *The Winter's Tale.* Each of these has died during the progress of the play concerned, but Adam is not disposed of in any way. A possible explanation of the difficulty is that the actor taking the part of Adam was too important to be kept for that rôle, which would necessarily be a minor one after Adam and Orlando reach the forest. It is interesting to remember that a credible tradition represents Shakespeare himself as taking the part of Adam.[4] Rowe declares that "the top of his performance" as an actor was "the Ghost in his own *Hamlet.*" The two rôles are distinctly similar; both are old-man parts; each has but a small number of lines; each calls for good judgment, impressiveness, dignity.

Swinburne calls the betrothal of Oliver to Celia "that one unlucky slip of the brush which has left so ugly a little smear in one corner of the canvas."[5] But in Lodge, Saladyne (Oliver) bravely rescues the "fair shepherdess, Aliena" (together with Rosader and Ganymede), from a band of rascals who "thought to steal her away, and to give her to the king for a present; hoping, because the king was a great lecher, by such a gift to purchase all their pardons."[6] The play as we have it is so crowded that we cannot wonder that this incident was omitted entirely. Nevertheless, we wish that Shakespeare had made Oliver in some way bring forth fruits meet for repentance before being rewarded with the charming Celia.

I have always wondered that Shakespeare made no use of the passage in Lodge where Ganymede urges Rosader (Orlando) to give up his vain love for Rosalynde and woo the beautiful Aliena.

"How say you by this item, forester?" quoth Ganymede, "the fair shepherdess [Aliena] favors you, who is mistress of so many flocks. Leave

[4] Furness' edition, 129 f.
[5] *A Study of Shakespeare,* Chatto, p. 152.
[6] Baldwin, 83; Furness, 362.

off, man, the supposition of Rosalynde's love, when as watching at her you rove beyond the moon, and cast your looks upon my mistress, who no doubt is as fair though not so royal; one bird in the hand is worth two in the wood: better possess the love of Aliena than catch furiously at the shadow of Rosalynde."[7]

But Rosader is faithful to the Rosalynde whom he supposes to be far away.

Imagine Julia Marlowe as Ganymede making this suggestion to Orlando in an off-hand, careless manner, at the same time watching him sharply in order to learn the real state of his affections. A telling contrast between the real and the assumed feelings of Rosalind-Ganymede would thus come to expression in a most interesting way. Did not the dramatist neglect here a thrilling situation, a notable opportunity for intense acting?

Not content with the five lines of action borrowed from Lodge, Shakespeare adds to these a striking character-interest, that of Jaques, and the mating of Touchstone and Audrey. Although the melancholy Jaques has nothing to do in the play—and does it—he is a fortunate addition. His pungent comments upon those about him and on human life relieve the general tone of sugary romanticism. "So mysterious and attractive is this character," says Furness, "that, outside of England at least, Jaques has often received a larger share of attention than even Rosalind." But the very fact that he really does nothing in the play, and that the nature of his past life and the reason for his being in Arden are not clearly brought out, makes it difficult to understand his character. Furness comments thus upon the varied interpretations of this enigmatic fellow:

"With the sole exception of Hamlet, I can recall no character in Shakespeare of whom the judgments are as diverse as of this 'old gentleman,' as Audrey calls him. Were he really possessed of all the qualities attributed to him by his critics, we should behold a man both misanthropic and genial, sensual and refined, depraved and elevated, cynical and liberal, selfish and generous, and finally, as though to make him still more like Hamlet, we should see in him the clearly marked symptoms of incipient insanity."[8]

Is Jaques an invention of Shakespeare, or one more borrowing?

[7] Baldwin, 62; Furness, 351.

[8] Variorum ed. of *As You Like It*, p. vi.

Professor E. E. Stoll has demonstrated in an admirable paper that Jaques was suggested by the character Malevole, the Malcontent, the title-hero of John Marston's play *The Malcontent*.[9]

I summarize very briefly a portion of the action of *The Malcontent*. Altofronto, the former Duke of Genoa, has been banished by a usurper. He has returned to Genoa in disguise and lives there as Malevole, the Malcontent. While waiting and watching for a chance to regain his former power, he utters cynical comments upon those about him and their doings. Because he is considered a little beside himself, and not amenable to ordinary rules, he is not held responsible for his bitter speeches. The usurping Duke, unsuspicious, tolerates the unknown railer, though declaring that "his speech is halter-worthy at all hours." At the close Malevole seizes his rightful dukedom and rewards his friends, especially his faithful and long-suffering wife.

In this play there is a remarkable power of biting epigram, particularly in the speeches of the Malcontent himself. I cite two examples:

Pietro. . . . There is no faith in man.

Malevole. In none but usurers and brokers; they deceive no man: men take 'em for blood-suckers, and so they are.

IV, iv, 20 ff.

Emilia. . . . How many servants [lovers] thinkest thou I have Maquerelle?

Maquerelle. The more, the merrier. 'Twas well said, use your servants as you do your smocks; have many, use one, and change often.

IV, i, 57 ff.

Marston's character Malevole is organic, central to his play; Shakespeare's Jaques is an entirely superfluous person, much as we enjoy him. I will not repeat the details of Stoll's convincing argument, except to note that the close of *As You Like It* plainly copies the more fitting close of *The Malcontent*. I quote some of the last lines of Shakespeare's play. They are spoken by Jacques.

[*To the Duke.*] You to your former honor I bequeath,
Your patience and your virtue well deserves it:
[*To Orlando.*] You to a love that your true faith doth merit:
[*To Oliver.*] You to your land and love and great allies:

[9] "Shakspere, Marston, and the Malcontent Type," *Modern Philology*, III, 281-303, especially 281-88.

[*To Silvius.*] You to a long and well-deserved bed:
[*To Touchstone.*] And you to wrangling; for thy loving voyage
Is but for two months victuall'd. So, to your pleasures;
I am for other than for dancing measures.
V, iv, 192-199.

At the close of *The Malcontent,* Altofronto, the restored Duke of Genoa, announces the destiny awaiting each important character. In his mouth this announcement has real fitness; but Jaques has no natural right or power to determine the fate of his companions. Stoll says justly: "Like Malevole, after a fashion unique in Shakspere, and in keeping only with a duke or sovereign, Jaques portions off their lot of weal or woe to the various persons of the drama."[10]

The characters Touchstone, Audrey, and William, and the story of the mating of Touchstone and Audrey, are entirely new to *As You Like It.* There is no reason to doubt that this element of the play is of Shakespeare's own invention. Furness asks concerning Touchstone:

"Is the 'clownish fool' and the 'roynish clown' of the First Act, with his bald jests of knights and pancakes, the Touchstone of the Fifth Act, who has trod a measure, flattered a lady, been politic with his friend and smooth with his enemy? Is the simpleton of the First Act, 'Nature's natural' as he is in truth, the same with the Touchstone who can cite Ovid and quarrel in print, by the book? Are there not here two separate characters?"[11]

These questions seem to me over-refined. In the second scene of the play a Clown enters, summons Celia to her father, and perpetrates the jest about the pancakes. In the next scene, when Rosalind and Celia plan to seek out the banished Duke in the forest of Arden, Rosalind proposes that they "steal the clownish fool out of your father's court" to "be a comfort to our travel." It is entirely uncalled for, and something that no practical dramatist would think of, to make the Touchstone who actually accompanies the girls on their journey to Arden a different person from the "clownish fool" whom they planned to take with them,

[10] P. 283. Friedrich Radebrecht, *Shakespeare's Abhängkeit von John Marston,* Cöthen, 1918, does not take up the question of the indebtedness of *As You Like It* to Marston.

[11] P. 309.

or different from the Clown of the second scene. Miss Porter is probably right in suggesting that when Celia in the second scene calls the "Clown" a "whetstone" sent by Nature to sharpen the dull wits of herself and her cousin, Shakespeare is thinking of the Clown's name Touchstone.[12]

George Bernard Shaw says derisively: "And then Touchstone, with his rare jests about the knight that swore by his honor they were good pancakes! Who would endure such humor from any one but Shakespeare? An Eskimo would demand his money back if a modern author offered him such fare." [13]

Shakespeare's treatment of this character of his own invention seems to me somewhat wavering and uncertain. In the third scene of the play Touchstone is conceived as a faithful fellow, entirely true to his kind mistress Celia, who says of him:

> He'll go along o'er the wide world with me.

This seems like a preliminary study for that marvel of characterisation, the bitter-sweet Fool of *King Lear*.

But how shall we interpret Touchstone's affair with Audrey in the latter part of the play? Does he love her? Gervinus and Boas hold that he intends to cast her off at a convenient season. Has the faithful one become faithless? "He seems" to Gervinus "equally devoid of the morality of either town or country." At the close of the play Jaques says to Touchstone:

> And you [I bequeath] to wrangling; for thy loving voyage
> Is but for two months victuall'd.

What weight shall we give to this cynical prophecy? I prefer not to press these words, but simply to say with Maginn that Jaques "cracks upon Touchstone one of those good-humored jests to which men of the world on the eve of marriage must laughingly submit." [14] However, I feel that Shakespeare uses Touchstone to secure comic effects without very much regard to consistency.

John D. Rea believes that the introduction of Jaques and the "group of fools and rustics who furnish material for his melancholy philosophizing" was suggested to Shakespeare by Erasmus'

[12] *As You Like It* in the *First Folio Edition*, Crowell, p. 121.
[13] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, vol. II, 119. N. Y., 1913.
[14] Furness, p. 284.

celebrated *Praise of Folly*. This book was "intended to show the folly of the professional wise men by contrast with the real wisdom of those usually accounted fools." Touchstone is one of these wise fools.[15]

I have already accepted Stoll's view concerning the origin of Jaques. The parallels pointed out by Rea between the satire of Erasmus and the play of Shakespeare may well indicate some indebtedness, but no element of the plot can come from Erasmus.

The reader may well think that the seven interests already named, six of them actions, make up the entire play. But they do not. The charm of the forest life is also an important interest. Three of the scenes have no reason for being in the play except that they help to suggest a breezy woodland existence. In the first of these, Act II, Scene i, Duke Senior praises the fellowship and even the rigors of the forest life:

> Now, my co-mates and brothers in exile,
> Hath not old custom made this life more sweet
> Than that of painted pomp?

In Act II, Scene v, the song "Under the greenwood tree" begins with this favorite line taken from the Robin Hood ballads.[16] Act IV, Scene ii, with its song over the dead deer, contributes to the woodland atmosphere. Moreover, all the more characteristic scenes of the play have a forest setting, or speak bewitchingly of life in the greenwood. The first scene of the play introduces this element in words of unforgettable charm:

> *Oliver.* Where will the old Duke live?
> *Charles.* They say he is already in the forest of Arden, and a many merry men with him; and there they live like the old Robin Hood of England. They say many young gentlemen flock to him every day, and fleet the time carelessly, as they did in the golden world.

Professor R. G. Moulton even terms the life in Arden Forest a "Woodland Action."[17] This unusual expression indicates the importance of this element of the play.

Three short folk-plays dramatizing well-known ballads about

[15] "Jaques in Praise of Folly," *Modern Philology*, XVII (1919), 465-69.

[16] See, for example, the second stanza of *Robin Hood and the Monk*, No. 119 in *Child's English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, 1882-98.

[17] *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*, 3d ed., Clarendon Press, 1893, p. 415.

Robin Hood have come down to us, two of them unfortunately incomplete.[18] There can be no doubt that the Robin Hood ballads are one source for the setting of this play of life in the open.

Professor A. H. Thorndike, following a suggestion of Fleay,[19] holds that Shakespeare was led to dramatize Lodge's pastoral and forest story of *Rosalynde* in 1599, when it was already nine years old, by the success of the two Robin Hood plays of Munday and Chettle, *The Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntington* and *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntington.*[20] These were acted in 1598 by Henslowe's Company, and "were successful enough to be given at court in the Christmas season" of that year. Thorndike finds that "in the years 1597-1600, pastoral plays were especially popular on the London stage." "In dramatizing a popular novel," says Thorndike, Shakespeare "introduced scenes presenting a picture of life already familiar on the stage—or, to put the case boldly, he added a Robin Hood element to *As You Like It* in rivalry of Robin Hood plays then being acted at an opposition theatre." Here, then, as in various other cases, Shakespeare followed the lead of other men, but produced a far superior result.

This claim of Thorndike may well be correct; I believe that it is. However, the case is more an example of Shakespeare's alchemy than of his indebtedness. What he 'borrowed' from these preceding plays is largely something that was not there, except in intention. Schelling says truthfully: "Munday and Chettle totally failed in reproducing the atmosphere of Sherwood Forest that breathes through the [Robin Hood] ballads." [21]

George Bernard Shaw sneers at *As You Like It,* a play for which he has an extreme dislike. He terms Rosalind "a fantastic sugar doll," and he makes the strange suggestion that the title of the play was given in a spirit of ill-humor as a stinging satire. He holds "That Shakespeare found that the only thing that paid in the theatre was romantic nonsense, and that when he

[18] The best edition is in Manly, *Specimens of the Pre-Shakspercan Drama,* Ginn, I, 279-288.

[19] See *The Life and Work of Shakespeare,* London, 1886, p. 208.

[20] "The Relation of *As You Like It* to Robin Hood Plays," *Journal of Germanic Philology,* IV, 59-69. The two plays mentioned are reprinted in Hazlitt's Dodsley, 1874, vol. VIII.

[21] *Elizabethan Drama,* II, 154.

was forced by this to produce one of the most effective samples of romantic nonsense in existence—a feat which he performed easily and well—he publicly disclaimed any responsibility for its pleasant and cheap falsehood by borrowing the story and throwing it in the face of the public with the phrase 'As You Like It.'" [22]

The contention that the dramatist was consciously conforming to the popular taste in this play is probably correct; but there is no reason to think that in doing this he was in a bad humor.

That Shakespeare shows special contempt for *As You Like It* "by borrowing the story" is a surprising suggestion. As a rule his plays were derived from sources that we know. I cannot go into details, but it is probable that *Love's Labour's Lost* and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream,* both written early in his career, are the only plays of the dramatist that are to be looked upon as presenting stories which are largely of his own invention. The manner in which he manipulates and supplements the material derived from his sources is, therefore, a fundamental subject of study in estimating aright the genius of Shakespeare. This topic is especially interesting in the case of *As You Like It.*

ALBERT H. TOLMAN.

The University of Chicago.

NOTES ON BURNS AND ENGLAND

It is becoming more and more the fashion to recognize Burns's interest in and debt to England, despite the fact that his critics and biographers, for many decades after his death, did their best to establish the "entirely Scottish" theory which we now realize to be unfounded on fact.[1] That Burns owed much to the vernacular tradition established by the Sempills, Hamilton of Gilbertfield,

[22] *The London Daily News,* April 17, 1900, p. 12, kindly lent me by Professor Archibald Henderson. See also Shaw's *Dramatic Opinions and Essays,* N. Y., 1907, II, 116-22.

[1] For examples of characteristic criticism emanating from north of the Tweed, see Jeffrey's and Scott's reviews of Cromek's *Reliques,* in the *Edinburgh Review* for Jan. 1809 and the *Quarterly* for Feb. 1809, respectively; also Carlyle's comments (1828) and Lockhart's (1838). Later, when source-study was becoming fashionable, Principal Shairp, Stevenson, John Stuart Blackie, and a good many others only less influential contributed

Ramsay, and Fergusson, no one would deny. Equally true is it that he owed much—how much, indeed, no one knew till the *Centenary Burns* appeared,—to the unknown authors of Scottish song. But constant iteration of this fact will never establish the full truth of Burns's literary relationships, unless it be the case that his debt to other than Scottish writers was so slight as to be negligible. I think it can be shown that Burns was closer to the English literary tradition of his day than has been generally recognized; so close, indeed, that until one realizes how much more he was than the last of the vernacular school, one can understand neither the man nor his work.

Consider first Burns's use of the English language. As President Neilson has pointed out, the old idea that Burns wrote well only in Scots, is not in accord with the facts. Many of his best-known, most characteristic, and most poignant verses are pure English. In his letters, where there is virtually none of the vernacular, one finds more evidence of his mastery of English. It has long been the fashion—we seem to have taken the cue from Carlyle—to belittle these prose relics, and to point to their stilted phraseology as proof that Burns was ill at ease in the Southron tongue. But I think that a very few minutes' reading will convince anyone that the artificiality of phrase which cumbers so many of the pages is certainly to be ascribed to Burns's attempt to master an "epistolary style" utterly foreign to him, and not to the language. Indeed, when one passes over the Sylvander-Clarinda correspondence, and the many letters to persons above the poet in social rank, and turns to those, say, to Thomson, or Mrs. Dunlop, one finds him writing simply and effectively, and with a command of the language which shows how far wrong he was in speaking of English as a foreign tongue. It was as much his own as the "braid Scots" of "Tam." Indeed, when once or twice he writes a letter in the vernacular, it is an obvious *tour de force*.[2] And the fact that in 1787 most

to the development of the dogma. South of the boundary Matthew Arnold and W. E. Henley are only two of many who have commented on the "Scottishness" of Burns, and have helped build up the idea that not only is his literary ancestry predominantly Scottish, but that his good work is to be found only in the dialect poems.

[2] See for instance the letter to William Nicol, 31 May 1787; *Scott Douglas*, IV, 243.

intelligent lowland Scotsmen could have written English prose as readily as Scottish, and would hardly have thought of using anything else in correspondence, does not lessen the importance of the too often forgotten fact that Burns had excellent control over this medium of expression.

Another connection with England appears in the books from which Burns formed his taste for reading. John Murdoch, the boy's first tutor, lists as "the books most commonly used in the school,"[3] the Spelling-book, the Bible, Mason's *Collection of Prose and Verse,* and Fisher's *Grammar.* Gilbert Burns adds the following to the list begun by Murdoch:[4] *The Complete Letter Writer,* Richardson, Fielding, Smollett, Pope, Addison, *The English Collection* (Mason's collection, referred to by Murdoch), and Fenelon's *Télémaque.* On this same matter hear the poet himself: "The earliest thing of composition I recollect taking pleasure in was 'The Vision of Mirza,' and a hymn of Addison's. . . . The first two books I ever read in private, and which gave me more pleasure than any two books I ever read again, were 'The Life of Hannibal,' and 'The History of Sir William Wallace.'"[5] A little later in the same letter Burns acknowledges his debt to the *Spectator,* Pope, Shakespeare, Locke, Boyle, Ramsay, and the *Select Collection of English Songs,* which is generally supposed to have been *The Lark,* 1751. Again he writes, "My reading was enlarged with the very important addition of Thomson's and Shenstone's works. . . . I had met with a collection of letters by the wits of Queen Anne's reign, and I poured over them devoutly. The addition of two more authors to my library gave me great pleasure; Sterne and Mackenzie—'Tristram Shandy' and 'The Man of Feeling'—were my bosom favorites. . . . My reading was only increased by two stray volumes of Pamela, and one of Ferdinand Count Fathom, which gave me some idea of novels. Rhyme, except for some religious pieces which are in print, I had given up; but meeting with Fer-

[3] *Scott Douglas,* IV, 346.

[4] "Narrative by Gilbert Burns"; *S. D.* IV, 352 ff.

[5] Autobiographical letter to Dr. Moore, *S. D.* IV, 4 ff. The first of the two books mentioned was probably Rowe's life of Hannibal (1737); the second was Hamilton of Gilbertfield's modernized (1722) English version, in orthodox couplets, very different from the old Scots poem.

gusson's Scotch Poems, I strung anew my wildly-sounding rustic lyre with emulating vigor." [6]

This reference to Fergusson's influence on the young Burns has been often commented on, and no one would question its significance, though the direct influence of Fergusson was hardly in proportion to the magniloquence of Burns's phraseology. But at the same time that one notes Burns's enthusiasm for his predecessor's work, one should also remember that his early books were chiefly English books, that he grew up in an atmosphere where English influences were at work on him, and that these English influences were, according to his own word, very considerable.

When, later in life, it was Burns's privilege to buy books, one finds him still turning to England. Thus on July 18, 1788, he orders Smollett and Cowper from his friend Peter Hill of Edinburgh.[7] Again, on April 2, 1789, from the same book-seller, Shakespeare and a Johnson's Dictionary.[8] A year later the following are on his lists: Otway, Jonson, Dryden, Congreve, Wycherley, Vanbrugh, Cibber, Macklin, Garrick, Foote, Coleman, and Sheridan.[9] More evidence of the same sort could be added, if more were needed, to show his continuous interest in English literature.

Look at the question from another angle. What sort of incidental allusions, quotations, references, does one find in Burns's letters? Does he seem, judged by these *obiter dicta*, to be interested chiefly in Scottish literature? Quite the contrary. If one were to estimate Burns by his letters alone, one would think of him as a man who wrote Scottish songs because he liked to, but who knew eighteenth century English letters far better than Scots, and esteemed them more highly. Thus we find him alluding, in a manner which indicates a considerable degree of familiarity with the person named, to Addison, Cowper, Fielding, Goldsmith, Gray, Johnson, Mackenzie, "Ossian," Pope, Shenstone, Smollett, Sterne, Young, and to various periodicals, notably the *Spectator* and *Rambler*.[10] Of the English poets whose work did not fall within the somewhat uncertain limits of the eighteenth century he refers to Donne, Shakespeare, Milton, and Spenser. All in all, Burns

[6] *S. D.* IV, 151.
[7] *S. D.* V, 140.
[8] *Ibid.* 225.
[9] *Ibid.* 304.
[10] Not all these persons are English by nativity, but all belong to the English tradition. I omit the dramatists already listed.

knew a good deal of English literature, and it is obvious that he knew much of it rather well.

In this connection it may be interesting to point out that among the whole list of English poets the following are his favorites, if we may judge by the frequency of allusion: Thomson, Shakespeare, Young, Milton, "Ossian," and Shenstone. Among the prose writers Mackenzie and Sterne are mentioned most often, and both may fairly be included in the list of non-Scottish influences. Obviously Burns was right when he said, "My favorite authors are of the sentimental kind, such as Shenstone . . . Thomson, Mackenzie, Sterne, Ossian. . . . These are the glorious models after which I endeavour to form my conduct."[11] He might have written, "Of the sentimental and English kind."[12]

[11] *S. D.* IV, 41.

[12] Parenthetically, I question whether it has ever been pointed out how thorough-going a sentimentalist Burns really was. Critics have noted his fondness for Mackenzie, the obvious sentimentalism in the Clarinda correspondence, and in many of the poems. In the letters to Mrs. M'Lehose, indeed, he seems at times almost to have been writing with a volume of Sterne open before him. Thus on June 25, 1794, he says: "Here I am set, a solitary hermit, in the solitary room of a solitary inn, with a solitary bottle of wine before me"—as near as his conscience would allow to Sterne's "one solitary plate, one knife, one fork, one glass." This, to Miss Wilhelmina Alexander, 18 Nov. 1786, can hardly be matched outside of Sterne: "It was a golden moment for a poetic heart. I listened to the feathered warblers, pouring their harmony on every hand, with a congenial kindred regard, and frequently turned out of my path, lest I should disturb their little songs, or frighten them to another station. Surely, I said to myself, he must be a wretch indeed, who, regardless of your harmonious endeavour to please him, can eye your elusive flights to discover your secret recesses, and rob you of all the property nature gives you—your dearest comforts, your helpless nestlings. Even the hoary hawthorne twig that shot across the way, what heart at such a time but must have been interested in its welfare, and wished it preserved from the rudely browsing cattle, or the withering east?" (*S. D.* IV, 160). In 1794 he writes to George Thomson, apropos of the heroine of "Craigieburn Wood": "The lady on whom it was made is one of the finest women in Scotland; and in fact (*entre nous*), is, in a manner, to me, what Sterne's Eliza was to him—a Mistress, or Friend, or what you will, in the guileless simplicity of Platonic love." (*S. D.* VI, 311. The lady in question was Jean Lorimer.) He was in truth a disciple of Parson Yorick; in addition to the women for whom his passion was much more than sentiment, there is a long list of the adored ones for whom he was forced to limit his

If Burns's prose furnishes good evidence of his interest in English letters, it might be supposed that it would make equally clear that debt to Scottish poetry which has been so often commented on. This, however, is not the case. To begin with, the total number of references to Scottish vernacular literature is slight; of the old "makars" he mentions Barbour, "Blind Harry," and James I, but not in a way that indicates any actual familiarity with their works. Once he refers to "Scotland's Complaint." Of the more recent poets, those with whom he had more in common, he mentions Fergusson rarely but enthusiastically, Ramsay fairly often, and his own contemporaries, whom he calls "Scottish poetasters, . . . ill-spawned monsters,"[13] two or three times. There are, of course, many references to Scottish song, and a number to the traditional ballads, which were neither Scottish nor English, but both. But on the whole the allusions to Scottish vernacular poetry are surprisingly few.

Again, one finds that by comparison with the large number of references to English poetry, Burns's comments on Scottish literature appear more negligible than they really are. Thus Ramsay, whom he seems to have known best among the Scots, figures in the correspondence less than half as often as Thomson.

Of course no one would suggest that the influence of these two poets can in any final sense be determined by the frequency of Burns's allusions to them. But I am convinced that such facts as these I have been trying to set forth, though not contradicting the old idea of a profound Scottish influence on the poet, make it

affection to what Sterne calls that "tender and delicious sentiment which ever mixes in friendship where there is a difference in sex." But Burns's sentimentalism went deeper than mere imitation of Sterne. He had persuaded himself, through the exercise of his reason, as he thought, that the emotions and not the intellect should be the guide of life; he believed in the perfectibility of mankind: "I am in perpetual warfare with that doctrine of our reverend priesthood that 'we are born into this world bond-slaves of iniquity and heirs of perdition, wholly inclined to that which is evil.' . . . I believe in my conscience that the case is just quite contrary." Thus he at least approaches the position of the philosophical sentimentalists of the mid-eighteenth century. But this of Burns's sentimentalism is of itself a large question. I mention it now only to add a little evidence of his interest in eighteenth century English thought.

[13] *S. D.* v. 215.

certain that he was more interested in English literature than has been generally recognized.[14]

FRANKLYN B. SNYDER.

Northwestern University.

THE RIMES OF STEFAN GEORGE

Although the battle over the significance of Stefan George in the development of the modern German lyric has not yet been ended, some critics such as Zwymann [1] and Lewisohn [2] calling him the greatest living lyrist, and others again such as Koch [3] and Grummann [4] styling him a mere *poseur* and euphuist,[5] there is

[14] To the discussion of Burns's relations to England W. P. Ker has made an interesting contribution in the *Scottish Historical Review* for October, 1917. He points out that Burns had a great interest in history, but that he preferred English to Scottish, and that at the very time he was writing his most "Scottish" poems he was busily studying English history. Professor Ker further alludes to the fact that poems by Burns appeared in the *Annual Register*, and that Burns published both prose and verse in the London *Star*. The "Address to the Deil" and the "Dedication" are in the *Register* for 1787 (publ. 1789). The list of poems sent to London is not long, but is more considerable than Professor Ker indicates. To Peter Stuart's *Star* Burns sent the "Ode Sacred to the memory of Mrs. Oswald," "On the Duchess of Gordon's Reel-Dancing," "Ode on the Departed Regency Bill," "A New Song for the Kilmarnock Chapel," and the song, "Anna, thy Charms." To Mayne's *Star* he sent "The Whistle." To Lloyd's *Evening Post* went the "Elegy on the Departed Year"; to *St. James's Chronicle* the "Prologue for the Dumfries Theatre"; to the *Morning Chronicle* "Lines on a Banknote"; and to the *Gentleman's Magazine* the "Address to the Shade of Thomson." (For data, see notes to the *Centenary Burns*, under titles listed.)

[1] Kuno Zwymann, *Das Georgesche Gedicht*, 1902.

[2] Ludwig Lewisohn, *The Spirit of Modern German Literature*, 1915.

[3] Vogt-Koch, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, II, 3d ed., 1910.

[4] Paul H. Grummann in *The German Classics*, XVIII, 288-289.

[5] Personally, I can not judge George as highly as Lewisohn or Zwymann, his admirer, who goes so far as to speak of the poet's readers only as *die Geniessenden*, nor, on the other hand, can I agree with Grummann, who makes him out to be almost a rank charlatan. A more unbiased opinion probably lies between these two extremes, for a poet who resorts to such striking artificialities and externalities as George does in order to frighten off *die Allzuvielen* can not be counted among the greatest artists, while,

general agreement that he is a master of form, the disagreement centering around the question as to how far his remarkable formalistic finesse will prove salutary and reformatory. In brief space I propose to consider one phase of George's formalism—his rimes—, my study being based upon his more recent and mature work *Der siebente Ring*.[6]

An examination of *Der siebente Ring* with regard to rime shows the following:—

1. George is not, in his more recent work, noticeably abandoning the rimed couplets *abab, aabb,* and *abba* in favor of the unrimed pentameter, as Taylor Starck's article[7] might suggest. To be sure, there is a considerable number of unrimed pentametric poems in the *Ring* (they comprise about 60 pages out of approximately 200), but this is due, it seems, more to the nature of the subject-matter treated than to any change in George's style.

2. Attention has rightly been called to George's remarkable facility for re-introducing into the language archaic forms, some of which have been out of use for centuries, and for using unusual words and words hitherto not found in German poetry. It is worth noting that a large percentage of these words, also of George's unusual compounds, is found at the end of a riming line, introduced for the manifest purpose of the rime, it being George's theory that a given rime should be used by a poet only once or at most seldom. And it appears that it is precisely this theory which contributes to the difficulty of George's language, compelling him, as it does, ever to seek new riming material. It is my distinct impression that as soon as George stops riming, and writes blank verse, he becomes less obscure, although his manner remains the same. Some of the obsolete and unusual words, as well as words hitherto not found in German poetry, used in the riming syllables of the *Ring,* together with the words with which they rime, are:—*erdenriefen—sternentiefen* (51);[8] *kafiller—fosforschiller* (51); *spille—stille* (51); *höhtet—rötet* (55); *sprenkel—schenkel* (58); *befelden—helden* (63); *schrunde—kunde* (73); *schrunde—*

on the other hand, his remarkable steadfastness of purpose and fidelity to ideals throughout thirty years stamp him as more than a mere *poseur.*

[6] 2d ed., Georg Bondi, Berlin, 1909.

[7] *M. L. N.*, January, 1919.

[8] The numbers refer to the pages of the 2nd ed. of the *Ring.*

stunde (146); *reffen — treffen* (80); *trestern — gestern* (88); *gefistel—mistel* (74); *sode—tode* (90); *swiseseln—kieseln* (91); *jug—zerschlug* (91); *zugewunken—funken* (107); *glinstern—finstern* (110); *glosen—rosen* (111); *fodre—lodre* (115); *seime—keime* (119); *eppich—teppich* (121); *gestaupt—haupt* (128); *arven—harfen* (135); *schlüften—lüften* (142); *gemässe—gefässe* (147); *ranft—sanft* (159); *schwaden—laden* (169); *brüsche—büsche* (174). George is especially fond of *ge-* compounds, which he derived to some extent directly from the Middle High German. Among the more unusual ones in the *Ring* are:—*gekrös* (used also by Schiller), *getön, geweide, geschmetter, gespinn, geschwele, geraum, geleucht, gestühl* (used also by J. H. Voss), *gebäu, gezüchte, geflimme, gewinde, gekling, geduft.*

3. Beside those rimes mentioned above, George finds many unusual ones in more usual words, some of them extremely bold and rarely used by predecessors. They are the rule in his lyrics, not the exception. Some of them are:—*zerriss—zerspliss* (63); *tiegel—spiegel* (78); *bitternisse—risse* (79); *firmamente—langgetrennte* (70); *siebten — geliebten* (109); *drommete — flehte* (114); *makel — mirakel* (114); *maser — faser* (119); *lack — strack* (120); *karneol—lebewohl* (126); *zinnober—oktober* (132); *gekicher—dämmerlicher* (132); *pachtung—umnachtung* (178); *dunkel—karfunkel* (151); *plane—enziane* (134). Taken out of their context, some of the more extreme rimes border on the ludicrous, but, of course, they never create this impression upon the serious reader of George.

4. That George is a consummate master of perfect rime, easily the equal of Platen and superior to Liliencron, can not justly be denied. The only instances of imperfect riming which I have found in the *Ring* are *umsonst—sonnst* (103); *weit—geweiht* (136); *lust—verlust* (177), but these cases may be intentional, for sometimes George deliberately lets words rime with themselves, as on pages 77, 104, 156 and 162. The rime *nächste—äxte* (103) is undoubtedly pure in the poet's pronunciation. Rarely does George allow the endings *-ung* and *-heit* alone to make a rime (*schwung—vergöttlichung,* 113; *felsensprung—dämmerung,* 131; *trunkenheit — bereit,* 137); usually the rime includes more (*weiten — ewigkeiten,* 113; *erscheinung — einung,* 118; *dämmerungen—durchdrungen,* 121). Rime extending over two or more

words is also rare (*pocht er—tochter,* 107; *weht es—beetes,* 160; *klingt es—beschwingt es,* 157). An unusual phenomenon is *grau und silbern—blau und silbern* (107). So conscientious a purist is George with regard to rime that even such rimes as *dräut—beut* (117) and *hain—wein* (56), involving diphthongs of different spellings, seem to be shunned wherever possible. Cases of internal elision of a vowel, usually *e,* for the sake of the rime, are rare (*loh'n—tron,* 52; *ruft—schuf't,* 53). The *e* of the present infinitive is omitted or inserted in accordance with the requirements of the meter, often omitted (*wehn—sehn,* 111; *benedein—befrein,* 111; *lehn—geschehn,* 105; but *erkoren—geboren,* 105; *dorren—verworren,* 89).

5. George seems to make a point of riming the oblique cases of nouns frequently (*stückes—glückes,* 33; *wahnes—spanes,* 50; *krampfe—dampfe,* 50); he also likes to rime different parts of speech, often in inflected form (*verschneiten — gezeiten,* 89; *takte—nackte,* 168; *scheins—eins,* 175; *verderbst—herbst,* 175).

6. In a few instances the poet uses semi-rimes, probably for the purpose of creating a folk-song impression. A good example of this practise is *Der Widerchrist* (56), where *garn—horn; reich—weicht; schein—seim; trog—hof* are apparently used as quasi-rimes. Another instance is found on page 183.

7. George uses both masculine and feminine rimes with equal facility, but he seems to have a predilection for the feminine type, as it affords him more freedom for practising his great rimic skill.

8. Complicated rime schemes, such as the one used on page 161 (*abcadcefbedf*), are not frequent.

9. Internal rimes are rare in the *Ring.* The poem *Litanei* (148) may be quoted as an example of such riming.

Quite apart from the question of their literary value, there can be no doubt that for the student of lexicology, metrics and rime the lyrics of Stefan George will some day offer a fruitful field of investigation.

Edwin H. Zeydel.

Washington, D. C.

CHAUCER'S *PROLOGUE*, 1-7

Two passages in Boethius' *Consolation* may throw further light upon Chaucer's thoughts of the relationship between Zephyr and the arrival of new life in spring:

> Whan that Aprille with his shoures sote
> The droghte of Marche hath perced to the rote,
> And bathed every veyne in swich licour,
> Of which vertu engendred is the flour;
> Whan *Zephirus* eek with his *swete breeth*
> Inspired hath in every holt and heeth
> *The tendre croppes* . . . . (A, 1-7.)

Skeat, in his note on line 5, tells us that there are two references to Zephirus in Chaucer's translation of Boethius—in Book I, metre 5, and Book II, metre 3. In his note on the word "croppes," he refers a second time to the translation of Boethius—to Book III, metre 2, line 24. But the idea of consulting the Latin original of Chaucer's translation for relations to the Zephirus-breeth-tendre-croppes passage in the *Prologue* seems not to have occurred to Skeat.

Let us look, then, at the two Boethian passages to which Skeat first makes reference and at the two passages which Chaucer has translated from them:

> Tua uis uarium temperat annum,
> Ut quas boreae *spiritus* aufert,
> *Reuehat mites zephyrus frondes;*
> Quaeque arcturus semina uidit,
> Sirius altas urat segetes. (Lib. I, met. v, 18-22.)

Thy might atempreth the variaunts sesons of the yere; so that *Zephirus the deboneir wind bringeth ayein, in the first somer sesoun, the leves* that the wind that highte Boreas hath reft awey in autumpne, that is to seyn, in the laste end of somer; and the sedes that the sterre that highte Arcturus saw, ben waxen heye cornes whan the sterre eschaufeth hem. (I, m. 5, 14-20)

> Cum *nemus flatu zephyri* tepentis
> Vernis *inrubuit* rosis,[1]
> *Spiret* insanum nebulosus auster;
> Iam spinis abeat decus. (Lib. II, met. iii, 5-8.)

[1] Professor A. S. Cook has anticipated me in a study of lines 5-8 of Lib.

Whan *the wode wexeth rody of rosene floures, in the first somer sesoun, thorough the brethe of the winde Zephirus that wexeth warm,* yif the cloudy wind Auster blowe felliche, than goth awey the fairenesse of thornes. (II, m. 3, 7-10.)

Now just what is it that these four passages, Latin and English, tell us about the breath of Zephyr and the tender crops? They tell us in the first place that Chaucer had studied over two passages of Boethius and that, in his translation of them, he had thought of the breath of Zephyr as a thing which brought back life *in* or *into* the leaves of the vernal season. In the first passage he was conscious that the *spiritus* (= 'spirit' or 'breath') of Boreas carried off the leaves "in autumpne" and that the wind Zephyr brought those leaves back "in the first somer sesoun." It is clear that he did not think that the wind blew the dead leaves up from the ground to grow again on the trees; he thought rather that Zephyr caused new foliage to shoot upon those trees,

> Ut quas boreae *spiritus* aufert,
> *Reuehat mites zephyrus frondes.*

In the second passage he was conscious of a wood,—or, to paraphrase, of a *holt*,—that waxed "rody of rosene floures, in the first somer sesoun," because of the breath (= *flatu*) of Zephyr blowing warm upon it.

> Cum nemus *flatu zephyri tepentis*
> Vernis inrubuit rosis.

It is apparent, then, that Chaucer, some years before he wrote the *Canterbury Tales*,[2] had known from Boethius[3] a wind, Zephyr, the *spiritus* or *flatu* of which inspired the springtime. It is, I believe, that latter sort of wind that appears in the first lines of the *Prologue*.

But the Latin passages do not stop there. They have something to tell us in the second place also. That is that one of them offers

II, met. 3, in connection with line 5 of the *Prologue*. See his "Chaucerian Papers," *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XXII, 1-63.

[2] The Prologue of the *Canterbury Tales* cannot date before 1386-1387. See Skeat, III, 372.

[3] The translation from Boethius dates from 1377-1383. See Skeat, II, vii.

a very close parallel to the "tendre croppes" of Chaucer. Let us observe this:

Ut quas . . . *spiritus* aufert,
Reuehat *mites* zephyrus *frondes*.
(Lib. I, met. v, 19-20.)

Whan Zephirus eek with his swete
breeth
Inspired hath in every holt and
heeth
The tendre croppes . . . (A, 1-7.)

The Middle English words "tendre croppes" offer a most logical and acceptable translation of the Latin words "mites . . frondes"! Like the latter they are equally applicable to the new shoots that appear on the tiniest shrub or on the mightiest oak. It is true that *Harpers' Latin Dictionary* does not specifically offer "tendre" as a translation for "mitis," and true that the first given literal meanings of that word—*mild, mellow, mature*—refer to the softness that accompanies ripeness rather than budding; but it is obvious that the softness referred by Boethius to the word "mitis" *is a softness in new foliage ripening from bud to mature leaf* in the spring, advent of which under a Zephyrian influence he is describing, rather than a softness of autumn leaf or fruit. It is, beyond question, such a softness that Chaucer is thinking of in his "tendre croppes," inspired in every holt and heath by "Zephirus."

So much for "tendre."

Brief comment upon the word "croppes," or upon its singular form "crop," will also be relevant.

In the singular or in the plural it was used commonly, according to the evidence of the *NED.*, in the Middle Ages and in the Fourteenth Century to define the top of a herb or flower or plant; that is to say, in a sense hardly different from its application in our own times, as we think of the top parts of plants which we harvest. Gower, who uses the word but twice, uses it most clearly once in this sense:

The lilie croppes on and on,
Wher that thei weren sprongen oute,
He smot of, as thei stode aboute. . . .
(*Confessio Amantis*, VII, 4678-80.)

Chaucer, according to the evidence of Skeat's glossary, uses the word seven times. In two places it means distinctly the tops of trees: *Romaunt of the Rose*, 1396; *Book of the Duchess*, 424. In one place it rather apparently means the tops of trees: A, 1532.

In three places it may refer as much to the heads of plants as to the heads of trees: *Boethius* III, m. 2, 23; *Troil.* II, 348 and V, 25. The seventh instance of its use is the one in the *Prologue,* line 7.

In the singular the word is used by Chaucer most distinctly to mean tree-top in that passage of his translation of Boethius to which Skeat refers us in his note on line 7; that is, in Book III, metre 2. For convenience we may quote again from Chaucer's translation and from Boethius' Latin:

> The yerde of a tree, that is haled a-doun by mighte strengthe, boweth redily the *crop* a-doun; but yif that the hand of him that it bente lat it gon ayein, anon the *crop* loketh upright to hevene. (III, m. 2, 22-25)

> Validis quondas uiribus acta
> Pronum flectit uirga *cacumen:*
> Hanc si coruans dextra remisit,
> Recto spectat uertice caelum.
> (Lib. III, met. 2, 27-30.)

Here obviously "crop" is Chaucer's translation of "cacumen," a word which can offer neither confirmation nor refutation of the very close resemblance, previously instanced, of "tendre croppes" to "mites . . frondes": so that further discussion of it is unnecessary.

To conclude, however, it is clear that the two Boethian passages first quoted must be taken into the reckoning when students of Chaucer try to find analogies to parts of the poet's description, in the early lines of the *Prologue,* of the first influence of spring upon nature. The second of the two makes its appearance in that connection, I believe, here for the first time.

Addendum

With further reference to A, 5-7, Professor Lowes, in his article in *Modern Philology,* XV, 689 ff., is disposed to consider it as offering a very close verbal resemblance to a brief excerpt from Boccaccio's *Filocolo.* The excerpt which Professor Lowes quotes from the Italian is as follows:

> *Come quando Zeffiro soavemente spira si sogliono le tenere sommita degli alberi muovere per li campi.* (Filocolo II, 239 (Ed. Moutier))

Translated literally this pasage yields, 'When Zephyr breathes softly the tender tree-tops are wont to sway in the fields.' There is no explicit thought in it that the warm breath of the wind is a force in nature that produces growth in the bud which results in the shooting out of new and tender foliage on shrub and tree. And we may well question if there is an implicit thought to that effect. I believe (unless the most conclusive proofs are found to show that Chaucer knew and read the *Filocolo*) the text of Boethius will block all the apparent force of Professor Lowes' parallel.

(1) Boethius' *flatu zephyri tepentis* (Lib. II, met. 3, 5) offers as good a parallel as Boccaccio's *soavemente spira* to Chaucer's *with his swete breeth.* The Latin says only warm breath; the Italian only soft breath.

(2) His *mites . . frondes* (Lib. I, met. 5, 21) is a closer parallel to Chaucer's *tendre croppes* than is Boccaccio's *tenere sommita degli alberi.* For Boethius' term, like Chaucer's, is equally applicable to new and tender growth on shrub and tree, while Boccaccio's can refer to tree-tops only.

(3) Boethius' view of the function of Zephyr coincides with Chaucer's view in the *Prologue* no less than in the translation from the *Consolation.*

(4) Furthermore it is plain that whatever force of resemblance may lie in the word "spira" of the *Filocolo* passage it is offset by the presence of "spiritus" in the first Boethian passage studied above (i. e., in Lib. I, met. 5, 19), and of "spiret" in the second (i. e., Lib. II, met. 3, 7).

I may add that neither in this connection nor elsewhere in his article has Professor Lowes shaken my belief that we have no adequate evidence for believing that Chaucer was acquainted with the *Filocolo,* a belief that was presented in my dissertation on *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio* (The University of Cincinnati Studies, 1916).

HUBERTIS CUMMINGS.

The University of Cincinnati.

VAUGHAN'S INFLUENCE UPON WORDSWORTH'S POETRY

On reading Vaughan's *Retreat,* one is at once struck with similarity between that poem and Wordsworth's *Ode, Intimations of Immortality.* Investigation of Vaughan's poetry as a source of Wordsworth's thought and inspiration does not seem to have gone farther than a mere passing comment that there is a great likeness between the two poems, and that Vaughan's poem probably inspired the other.

The resemblance between the *Retreat* and the *Ode* is, indeed, quite remarkable. Each poem opens with a description of the world as it appears in beauty to the child. Then, as the child grows up to manhood, there comes the gradual absorption of the spirit in the consideration of the material things of life, though now and then come the haunting memories of childhood, when all things appeared in the "glory and freshness of a dream." Although the substance of the two poems is much the same, they differ quite a little in their conclusions. Wordsworth is thankful that he has kept alive within him something of that spiritual vision of childhood, and that nature, with all its beauties, still means much to him. Though Vaughan's poem may be regarded as not so profound in its philosophy as Wordsworth's, and inferior as an artistic creation, yet he gives us what is lacking in the *Ode,*— a hope of returning again to the joy of childhood. Professor Reed, in commenting on the poems, says: "In its simpler meter, its quieter manner, its quainter diction, the *Retreat* seems nearer to that age of innocence which both poets celebrate."[1]

The similarity of the two poems is not in general content alone, but there is a singular likeness in the lines which does not seem to be merely the accidental result of treating the same subject. Vaughan's poem begins:—

> Happy those early days, when I
> Shin'd in my angel infancy!
> Before I understood this place

[1] Edward Bliss Reed, *English Lyrical Poetry,* New Haven, 1914.

Appointed for my second race,
Or taught my soul to fancy aught
But a white celestial thought.

These same ideas are separated in Wordsworth's poem. In section I we find:

There was a time when meadow, grove and stream,
The earth and every common sight,
To me did seem
Apparelled in celestial light.

In section IX:

. . . . . those obstinate questionings
Of sense and outward things,
Fallings from us, vanishings;
Blank misgivings of a Creature
Moving about in worlds not realized.

Vaughan, in speaking of the soul's progress through life, says:—

When yet I had not walked above
A mile or two from my first love,
And looking back—at that short space—
Could see a glimpse of His bright face.

In the *Ode* we find:—

The Youth, who daily farther from the east
Must travel, still is Nature's Priest,
And by the vision splendid
Is on his way attended.

Wordsworth rejoices

. . . that in our embers
Is something that doth live,
That nature yet remembers
What was so fugitive!

Vaughan felt

. . . through all this fleshly dress
Bright shoots of everlasting guess.

Wordsworth closes his poem with these exquisite lines:—

To me the meanest flower that blows, can give
Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears.

Vaughan expresses a similar thought when he says:

When on some gilded cloud, or flow'r,
My gazing soul would dwell an hour,
And in those weaker glories spy
Some shadows of eternity.

A like idea appears too in Wordsworth's line:

. . . . . the hour
Of splendor in the grass, of glory in the flower.

The ideas which Wordsworth has seemingly borrowed from Vaughan for his *Ode* do not appear in the *Retreat* alone, but the same thoughts occur in several of the earlier poet's works. The idea of the celestial light dying away, appears in Vaughan's *Man's Fall and Recovery* and in *The Pursuit.*

When one reads the opening lines of Vaughan's *Corruption:*

. . . . . Man in those early days
Was not all stone and earth;
He shin'd a little, and by those weak rays
Had some glimpse of his birth.
He saw heaven o'er his head, and knew from whence
He came, condemned, hither . . .

there is found a remarkable resemblance to Wordsworth's words:

Not in entire forgetfulness
And not in utter nakedness
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God who is our home.

In the *Excursion* (Book 9, l. 1, et seq.) we have Wordsworth's theory of nature. To him, Nature meant something more than the mere outward world or the universe. It was Life, Soul, God. He looked upon matter as being animated by Spirit,—an "active principle" which "subsists in all things." Similar ideas are to be found in Vaughan's *Come, What Do I Here?, Christ's Nativity* and *The Dawning.*

In *Regeneration* and in *The Waterfall,* Vaughan presents the idea of the beneficent, ethical influence of nature upon human life, an idea which Wordsworth strove to inculcate in the "Song at the Feast of Brougham Castle."

Wordsworth regarded every separate thing as having a soul from Nature:

A spirit and a pulse of good
A life and soul to every mode of being
Inseparably linked. (*The Cumberland Beggar*, l. 77 et seq.)

But not only did he regard every separate thing as having a soul from Nature, but each place as having a special character. This idea he presents in "Hart Leap Well" in which he shows Nature manifesting her disapproval of man when he seeks his pleasure at the expense of suffering on the part of one of its unoffending members. This idea he may have gathered from some of Vaughtan's lines in *The Stone.*

Hence sand and dust
Are shak'd for witnesses, and stones,
Which some think dead, shall all at once
With one attesting voice detect
Those secret sins we least suspect.
For know, wild men, that when you err
Each thing turns scribe and register,
And, in obedience to his Lord,
Doth your most private sins record.

Many of the ideas of Wordsworth's *The World is too much with us* may be found in Vaughan. In the following lines, from *Religion,* we have the idea of God, Nature, speaking less and less to man:—

My God, when I walk in those groves
And leaves, Thy Spirit doth still fan,
I see in each shade that there grows
An angel talking with a man.

Nay Thou Thyself, my God, in fire,
Whirlwinds and clouds, and the soft voice,
Speak'st there so much, that I admire
We have no conf'rence in these days.

Is the truce broke? or 'cause we have
A Mediator now with Thee,
Dost Thou therefore old treaties wave,
And by appeals from Him decree?

Or is't so, as some green heads says,
That now all miracles must cease?
Though Thou hast promis'd they should stay
The tokens of the Church, and peace.

In Vaughan's *Rules and Lessons* there is the Wordsworthian thought that "heaven's gate opens when this world's is shut," and advice is given how to live that we do not become too materialistic:—

Walk with thy fellow-creatures: note the hush
And whispers amongst them. There's not a spring
Or leaf, but hath his morning-hymn. Each bush
And oak doth know I AM. . . . . .

When the world's up, and ev'ry swarm abroad,
Keep thou thy temper; mix not with each clay:
Dispatch necessities; life hath a load
Which must be carri'd on, and safely may.
Yet keep those cares without thee, let the heart
Be God's alone, and choose the better part.

If the third, fourth and fifth stanzas of Vaughan's *Distraction* be read before the first and second, making the poem begin, "The World is full of voices," a marked resemblance to Wordsworth's *The World Is Too Much With Us* will at once be observed:

Distraction

O knit me, that am crumbled dust! the heap
Is all dispers'd and cheap;
Give for a handful but a thought,
And it is bought;
Hadst Thou
Made me a star, a pearl, or a rainbow,
The beams I then had shot
My light had lessen'd not;
But now
I find myself the less the more I grow.
The world
Is full of voices; man is call'd, and hurl'd
By each; he answers all,
Knows ev'ry note and call;
Hence, still
Fresh dotage tempts, or old usurps his will.
Yet hadst Thou clipp'd my wings, when coffin'd in
This quicken'd mass of sin,
And saved that light, which freely Thou
Didst then bestow,
I fear·
I should have spurn'd, and said Thou didst forbear:
Or that Thy store was less:

But now since Thou didst bless
So much,
I grieve my God! that Thou hast made me such.

A greater familiarity with all of Wordsworth's work instead of some few of his most famous poems, without doubt would show many more similarities in the ideas and compositions of these two men. One marked difference, however, in their work should be noted, and that is the Christian sentiment which pervades nearly all of Vaughan's writings, and which does not appear in Wordsworth's. Indeed, the dedication of Vaughan's *Silex Scintillans* is "To my most merciful, my most loving, and dearly loved Redeemer, the ever blessed, the only Holy and Just one, Jesus Christ."

Not only in these selections does there seem to be ample evidence that Wordsworth was familiar with Vaughan's poetry, but additional proof is to be found in the statement of Archbishop Trench to Grosart, that among Wordsworth's books there was a much-thumbed copy of Vaughan's poems. That Wordsworth possessed such a book Grosart verified by consulting a catalogue of the poet's books which were offered for sale, in which he found Vaughan's *Silex Scintillans* listed.

L. R. Merrill.

New Haven, Conn.

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY PROSODY: *HIER; FLÉAU; MEURTRIER; FUIR*

In an article entitled *les Innovations prosodiques chez Corneille*[1] M. Philippe Martinon has given the results of the most detailed study that has been made of Corneille's influence on French prosody. While reading plays in the period which he treats, I noticed a number of cases that are not altogether in accord with his statements. This was, of course, to be expected, for one cannot cover the whole field of seventeenth-century verse. My remarks will serve merely to add a few notes to an article that remains in most respects a model for this kind of research.

1. *Hier.* M. Martinon states that this word was monosyllabic in Old French verse, usually dissyllabic in that of the sixteenth

[1] *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1913, pp. 65-100.

century, always dissyllabic in the seventeenth century before Corneille except "chez quelques ignorants ou quelques entêtés."[2] According to him, Corneille always made the word monosyllabic and it was owing to his influence that Mairet, Thomas Corneille, Quinault, La Fontaine, Molière adopted the monosyllabic count. Boileau and Racine, he adds, were among the first to "revenir à la vérité" and give the word two syllables. Now it is doubtless true that Corneille's influence was extremely important in making it generally possible to treat *hier* as a word of one syllable, but it is by no means sure that this influence was felt by Mairet, who counted the word as monosyllabic in his *Virginie,* II, 3:

Euridice hier encor me promit de sa bouche;

and while the *Galerie du Palais,* in which Corneille first used the word *hier,* may have been acted before *Virginie* was, it was not printed till 1637, two years after the publication of the latter play. It was also published a year later than Scudéry's *Mort de César,* in which I find again the monosyllabic count, "Hier au soir ennuyé."[3] Moreover, Corneille did not succeed, even temporarily, in preventing the use of *hier* as a dissyllabic word. I find it so used, not only by Rotrou, who is the only one of Corneille's contemporaries mentioned by M. Martinon in this connection, but by the following authors: Beys, *Céline* (1637),[4] III, 4; Guérin de Bouscal, *la Suite de la Mort de César* (1637), II, 2; La Caze, *l'Inceste supposé* (1639), IV, 6, "qui partageoit hier"; Sallebray, *le Jugement de Pâris* (1639), III, 6 and *la Troade* (1640), I, 3, IV, 1, V, 3; Mareschal, *le Capitaine Matamore* (1640), II, 5, "que d'hier seulement"; La Caze, *Cammane* (1641), I, 1; Saint-Germain, *Timoléon* (1641), II, 2; Sallebray, *l'Amante ennemie* (1642), V, 9, "depuis hier au soir," and *la Belle Egyptienne* (1642), V, 1,

Qu' hier ie combatois vos bontés justement;

Guérin de Bouscal, *la Mort d'Agis* (1642), IV, 3 and *le Fils désavoué* (1642), V, 4.

[2] One might thus explain an example from Théophile cited by Quicherat, *Traité de versification française,* Paris, Hachette, 1850, p. 297, "que vous ne fîtes hier."

[3] V, last scene. I have consulted the second edition, that of 1637.

[4] Dates in this article, unless it is stated otherwise, are those of publication.

Mais pourquoy donc hier m'aduouer ma naissance;

Du Ryer, *Dynamis* (1652), III, 4,

Et si mon entreprise estoit hier un crime;

Brécourt, *la Feinte Mort de Jodelet* (1660), I, 3,

Comment ma tante morte, et d'hier au cercueil.

These examples cover fairly well the period between the *Cid* and *Andromaque* and show that Racine and Boileau were far from being among the first to return to the dissyllabic treatment. Indeed, the two counts seem to have existed side by side during the last three-quarters of the century. The influence of Boileau and Racine was important as a counterbalance to that of Corneille, but it is a mistake to hold that the use of the word as dissyllabic had died out when they began to write.

2. *Fléau* was monosyllabic in the sixteenth century and at the beginning of the seventeenth century, as it is in the pronunciation of peasants in parts of France to-day.[5] M. Martinon admits that exceptions to this usage occur in the works of Jean de la Taille and Alexandre Hardy,[6] who make the word dissyllabic, but he argues that these were incorrect poets, who followed local pronunciations without expressing any special ideas about prosody. He finds only slight variations among literary authors, that Saint-Amant makes the word dissyllabic once, monosyllabic six times, and that Rotrou and Scarron use it in both ways. Then Corneille in *Attila* "adopta la diérèse, qui a prévalu depuis." But *Attila* was neither acted, nor printed till 1667. I find that the word had already been counted as dissyllabic, not only in such obscure plays as the anonymous *Mort de Roger* (1626), II, 3:

Fleau, dont le destin les monarques guerroye,

and the *Pasiphaé* that is attributed to Théophile:[7]

Que vos fléaux sur tous s'étendent icy-bas,

---

[5] Especially in Normandy and in central France. Cf. *l'Atlas linguistique*, fascicule 13.

[6] He cites no example. One is found in *Lucrèce* (1628), reprinted by Stengel, Marburg, 1884, v, 190, "Ta louue, ton fleau, qui s'achemine icy."

[7] I, p. 13 in the edition of Paris, Gay, 1862, a reprint of the edition of Paris, 1628.

but also in plays by regular contributors to the Parisian repertory, the important *Mariane* of Tristan l'Hermite (1637), II, 5:

Et trouue que pour moy, c'est vn fleau celeste;

the *Mauzolée* of Mareschal (1642), II, 6, "ce fleau de l'Etat"; and the *Porus* of Boyer (1648), II, 1:

A ce cruel fleau de tous les Potentats.

This dissyllabic treatment had, therefore, a certain amount of support long before *Attila.* Corneille merely added his influence to that of others.

3. *Meurtrier* has, perhaps, attracted more attention than any other word containing a consonant + *l* or *r* + *i* + a vowel. M. Martinon states the case as follows. Corneille had already made *romprions* a word of three syllables in *Mélite* (1633). In the *Galerie du Palais* (1637) he counted *baudriers* in the same way; similarly *meurtrier* in *Médée* and the *Illusion comique.* But these three plays were not printed till after the *Cid* (1637), so that the first examples of which we can be sure are in the latter play, where *meurtrier* occurs three times and is always a word of three syllables, as in the celebrated line,

Il est juste, grand roi, qu'un meurtrier périsse,

which the Academy condemned with the remark that "ce mot de meurtrier qu'il répète souvent le faisant de trois syllabes, n'est que de deux." Corneille continued to count it as a three-syllable word. Was he the first to do so and did his contemporaries make their usage coincide with his? M. Martinon asserts that "il est certain que, pas plus que pour *fuir* et *fui,* on ne suivit Corneille immédiatement." [8] Now I find no case of diaeresis so early as the *romprions* of *Mélite,* but I do find trisyllabic *meurtrier* in plays printed earlier than the *Cid* or *Médée* and I can show that Corneille's usage was by no means peculiar in the period that followed the representation of the *Cid.*

As far as I have been able to determine, *meurtrier* as a word of three syllables first occurs [9] in the *Jaloux sans sujet* of Beys (1635), II, 3, "meurtrier amoureux" and

[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 91.

[9] Not to mention such incorrect authors as Troterel, *Sainte-Agnès,* Rouen,

Au moins beau meurtrier, contente mon enuie,

next in the *Cléopâtre* of Benserade (1636), III, 1:

Vous attendez la mort de ma main meurtriere.

The latter author in his *Gustaphe* (1637) makes it both dissyllabic (V, 3, "ce meurtrier inhumain") and trisyllabic (V, 7, "il est mon meurtrier"), but in his *Méléagre* (1641) only trisyllabic (V, 9, "et cette meurtriere"). Guérin de Bouscal, after treating the word three times as dissyllabic in *la Suite de la Mort de César* (1640), I, 1, 2 and III, 4, makes it trisyllabic two years later in *Sanche Panse,* III, 5, "sauver un meurtrier." Sallebray in his *Troade* (1640) makes it trisyllabic twice, III, 7, and dissyllabic three times, I, 1, 3, and 4. But in his *Amante ennemie* (1642) he gives only one example of the word as dissyllabic, I, 1, "le meurtrier de mon frere," four examples of it as trisyllabic, I, 2, "sur ce vieil meurtrier," II, 1, 2, and III, 2. Gabriel Gilbert makes it trisyllabic in his *Hypolite* (1640), III, 2, "du meurtrier d'un fils,"[10] and Desfontaines follows his example in his *Sémiramis* (1647),[11] "je suis sa meurtriere." Corneille was, therefore, by no means alone in this reform, though he is one of the few authors of his generation who never made the word dissyllabic.

4. *Fuir.* M. Martinon states that before Corneille the infinitive and the past participle of this verb were treated as dissyllabic, though in other verb forms *fui-* was considered a single syllable. The earliest example he finds in print of *fuir* or *fui* counted as a monosyllabic word occurs in Corneille's *Veuve* (1634), for Rotrou's *Ménechmes,* which also contains an example, though probably acted earlier than *la Veuve,* was not published till 1636. I find as early a case of it in de Rayssiguier's *Palinice, Circeine et Florice,*[12] IV, 2:

1615, reprinted at Paris, Librairie des Bibliophiles, 1875, p. 95, "Meschante meurdriere!" and Discret, *Alizon* (1637), reprinted by Fournier, *Le Théâtre français au XVIe et au XVIIe siècle,* II, 344, "car la main meurtrière."

[10] I find in his *Sémiramis* (1647), V, 2, "le meurtrier execrable," which is evidence, perhaps, that this play, though published after *Hypolite,* was written before it.

[11] Cited by the frères Parfaict, VII, 158.

[12] 1634. The *achevé d'imprimer* is not given.

Pour l'amour de vous seul ie le veux fuir aussi.

M. Martinon's statement, which I have quoted, that Corneille was not followed at once, should be modified in the light of examples from Du Ryer's *Clarigène* (1639), II, 5, "C'est lacheté de fuir";[13] Rotrou's[14] *Antigone* (1639), III, 1, "Se fuir aprés au gré des vents," and *Crisante* (1640), III, 2, "Pour la fuir et devoir n'en être pas avare"; Guérin de Bouscal's *Cléomène* (1640), III, 4; and Boyer's *Porcie romaine* (1646), I, 3, "peut bien fuir comme luy."

In all four cases the count which Corneille adopted coincided with the pronunciation of at least a considerable proportion of his contemporaries. M. Martinon has shown that he was quick to follow contemporary speech and absolutely consistent in his prosody. But he was not necessarily the first to make the changes I have discussed, nor was his the only influence that led to the general acceptance of the usage to which he adhered.

H. Carrington Lancaster.

CHATEAUBRIAND ET L'ABBÉ C. F. PAINCHAUD

Dans ses *Souvenirs d'un demi-siècle, ou Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire contemporaine, Montréal,* 1885, l'historien canadien Joseph-Guillaume Barthe raconte comment, alors qu'il était encore enfant, il s'arrêta, en 1835, au cours d'un voyage sur le Saint-Laurent, à Sainte-Anne Lapocatière et y rencontra l'abbé C. F. Painchaud, fondateur du collège de Sainte-Anne et ancien missionnaire à la Baie des Chaleurs. D'après Barthe, l'excellent abbé qui jouissait à cette date d'une véritable célébrité pour l'éloquence de ses sermons et surtout pour la façon pathétique et émouvante dont il chantait les hymnes sacrés, lui aurait communiqué sur le séjour de Chateaubriand au Niagara des documents d'une impor-

[13] In his *Argénis* (1631), I, 2, "pourquoy fuïr si viste?" and in his *Alcionée* (1640), IV, 3, "à fuir de moy mesme," Du Ryer made the infinitive dissyllabic. The change shown in *Clarigène* (1639) tends to support my theory that the latter play was written after *Alcionée*, though printed before it. Cf. my *Pierre Du Ryer, Dramatist*, Washington, 1912, p. 90.

[14] Edition of Paris, Desoer, 1820.

tance capitale. On pourra en juger par ce passage que nous détachons du récit de Barthe:

"Mais pour en revenir au supérieur de Sainte-Anne, il était homme du monde, à son heure, comme s'il avait été élevé pour la cour. Avec cela nature superbe, joviale et sympathique au possible, littérateur et même poète. Il nous fit confidence d'une petite joute de ce genre qu'il avait eue avec non moins que Chateaubriand lui-même, à Niagara, où il avait eu le bonheur de couler une semaine auprès de lui, et dont il avait consigné les pièces justificatives dans son album, délicieux de forme et de fond, qui faisait le plus précieux ornement de son salon, fort bien décoré du reste, par des tableaux de famille et des objets d'art variés qui accusaient à la fois la délicatesse et la diversité de ses goûts." [1]

On aperçoit du premier coup la valeur qu'offrirait un document de ce genre si nous pouvions le retrouver, et quel intérêt pour l'histoire littéraire présenterait le procès-verbal des conversations que Chateaubriand aurait eues chez les sauvages de Niagara avec le bon missionnaire. J'ai tout d'abord été d'autant plus tenté d'accepter le témoignage de Barthe que j'y trouvais l'explication d'un passage du *Génie du Christianisme* qui depuis longtemps m'intriguait.

On se souvient peut-être comment, dans le *Génie,* Chauteaubriand raconte qu'il a rencontré un apôtre chrétien "dans les solitudes américaines." "Un matin, je cheminais lentement dans les forêts, j'aperçus venant à moi un grand vieillard à barbe blanche et vêtu d'une longue robe, lisant attentivement dans un livre et marchant appuyé sur un bâton; il était tout illuminé par un rayon de l'aurore. . . . C'était un missionnaire de la Louisiane: il revenait de la Nouvelle-Orléans et retournait aux Illinois, où il dirigeait un petit troupeau de Français et de sauvages chrétiens. Il m'accompagna pendant plusieurs jours. . . . Ce saint homme avait beaucoup souffert; il racontait bien des peines de sa vie; il en parlait sans aigreur, et surtout sans plaisir, mais avec sérénité. . . . Il citait agréablement et souvent des vers de Virgile et d'Homère, qu'il appliquait aux belles scènes qui se succédaient sous nos yeux, ou aux pensées qui nous occupaient. Il nous parut avoir de vastes connaissances en tous genres, qu'il laissait à peine aper-

[1] Barthe, p. 101.

cevoir sous sa simplicité évangélique. . . . Nous eûmes un jour une longue conversation sur la Révolution française, et nous trouvâmes quelques charmes à causer des troubles des hommes, dans les lieux les plus tranquilles. Nous étions assis dans une vallée, au bord d'un fleuve, dont nous ne savions point le nom, et qui, depuis de nombreux siècles, rafraichissait de ses eaux cette rive inconnue. . . . (*Génie du christianisme,* IV partie, liv. iv, ch. viii).

Pour qui connaît les procédés de composition de Chateaubriand, la facilité avec laquelle il fond différentes scènes en une seule et réunit des événements séparés de plusieurs jours ou de plusieurs mois, les contradictions que l'on peut relever entre son récit et la note de Barthe n'ont tout d'abord rien d'alarmant. Qu'il ait transporté au bord d'un fleuve inconnu une scène qui, dans la réalité, se serait passée au Niagara, qu'il ait transformé en vieillard à barbe blanche un homme alors jeune, puisqu'il vivait encore en 1835, qu'il ait même entièrement transformé la géographie, il n'y aurait rien là que de naturel et d'habituel chez lui. L'essentiel, et ce qui semble bien ressortir des deux récits, c'est qu'il aurait bien rencontré, quelque part dans les solitudes américaines, un missionnaire avec qui il aurait eu de longues conversations. A tout le moins, et sans pousser l'enquête plus avant, on pourrait semble-t-il, trouver dans le récit de Barthe une preuve de plus que Chateaubriand est bien allé au Niagara et y a séjourné un certain temps.

Il restait cependant un dernier point à établir, le plus important. Qu'était devenu le précieux album dans lequel l'abbé Painchaud avait consigné ses entretiens avec le futur auteur du *Genie du Christianisme.* Etait-il possible de le retrouver après tant d'années? Les héritiers de l'abbé Painchaud, ou le bibliothécaire du Collège Sainte-Anne, s'étaient-ils bien rendu compte de sa valeur et l'avaient-ils conservé avec le soin que méritait un document de cette importance? Les recherches complémentaires que j'ai pu faire ne permettent malheureusement plus de laisser subsister aucun espoir de retrouver le procès-verbal des entretiens de l'abbé Painchaud et de Chateaubriand. Si le fameux album a pu exister, il ne renfermait certainement aucune pièce de ce genre, puisque l'abbé Painchaud s'il était déjà né au moment où Chateaubriand s'arrêtait à la cataracte n'avait à cette date que neuf ans.[2] Il n'a donc

[2] Pour la biographie de l'abbé Painchaud, consulter N. E. Dionne, *Vie de C.-F. Painchaud, prêtre, curé, fondateur du Collège de Sainte-Anne de la*

pu rencontrer Chateaubriand en Amérique et n'a pu se livrer avec lui à une joute oratoire et le récit de Barthe est manifestement faux.

Dans ces conditions, il semblait inutile de pousser l'enquête plus loin. Il restait cependant à déterminer qui, de Barthe ou de l'abbé Painchaud, s'était rendu coupable d'une inexactitude aussi flagrante et quelles circonstances avaient donné naissance à cette nouvelle légende sur Chateaubriand. Si le fameux album n'existe pas, et pour cause, par contre, les papiers de l'abbé Painchaud ont été conservés au Collège Sainte-Anne et c'est là que l'historien du bon abbé a pu les consulter pour rédiger sa biographie. Il ressort des pièces justificatives qu'il a publiées en appendice que l'abbé Painchaud, qui avait pour Chateaubriand l'admiration la plus vive a écrit à l'auteur du *Génie du Christianisme* et reçu de lui une lettre qu'il a pieusement conservée. C'est sans aucun doute cette correspondance qu'il a communiquée à Barthe en 1835 en même temps que le journal de ses voyages à la Baie des chaleurs, à la mission de Ristigouche et à la Tracadièche. On ne peut se montrer trop sévère à l'égard de Barthe d'avoir à cinquante ans de distance, et sans aucun doute après avoir lu Chateaubriand, brouillé les dates et les faits et opéré une *contaminatio* qui risquait de lancer les chercheurs sur une fausse piste. Tout en aboutissant, en somme, à un résultat négatif, notre enquête n'aura pas été cependant totalement inutile, si elle nous a permit d'arrêter, alors qu'il en était encore temps, une nouvelle légende qui, grâce aux affirmations si positives de Barthe, aurait pu se propager.

D'autre part la lettre écrite par l'abbé Painchaud à Chateaubriand, le 19 janvier 1826, nous apporte un précieux témoignage sur la gloire dont jouissait à cette date au Canada l'auteur du *Génie du Christianisme*.[3] "Ce pauvre Canadien inconnu," c'est ainsi qu'il s'intitule lui-même, qui a erré pendant huit ans chez les sauvages a versé d'abondantes larmes de religion et d'admiration à la lecture du *Génie*. "Je dévore vos ouvrages, dont la mélan-

Pocatière, Québec, 1894. Je tiens à exprimer ici toute ma reconnaissance à M. l'Abbé J. A. Nainfa, du Séminaire Saint-Sulpice de Baltimore, et à M. Auguste Boulet supérieur du Collège Sainte-Anne, qui m'ont signalé l'existence de cet ouvrage et m'ont si aimablement aidé pour tout ce qui suit.

[3] Dionne, 373-376.

colie me tue, en faisant néanmoins mes délices; c'est une ivresse. Comment avez-vous pu écrire de pareilles choses sans mourir?" écrit-il à celui qu'il appelle l'homme de la Providence et à qui il offre, dans le cas où une nouvelle révolution le forcerait à quitter de nouveau sa patrie, "un feu clair, des eaux limpides, une peau de castor et un ciel bleu." Chateaubriand n'était plus à l'âge où l'on court les aventures et les solitudes du Nouveau-Monde; c'est avec la grandiose mélancolie qu'il aimait alors qu'il répond, un an plus tard, à l'invitation de son admirateur lointain. On nous permettra de reproduire sa lettre et de la signaler au savant éditeur de sa correspondance, M. Louis Thomas.

Paris, le 29 avril 1827.

Si la date de votre lettre est exacte, monsieur, ce n'est qu'après plus d'un an que cette lettre me serait parvenue; je n'ai donc pu avoir l'honneur de vous répondre plus tôt. Je ne mérite pas sans doute, monsieur, les louanges que vous voulez bien me donner; mais croyez que je suis infiniment plus touché des éloges d'un *pauvre curé* du Canada, que je ne le serais des applaudissements d'un prince de l'Eglise. Je vous félicite, monsieur, de vivre au milieu des bois; la prière qui monte du désert est plus puissante que celle qui s'élève du milieu des hommes; toute pour le ciel, elle n'est inspirée, ni par les intérêts ni par les chagrins de la terre; elle tire sa force de sa pureté.

Désormais, monsieur, les tempêtes politiques ne me jetteraient sur aucun rivage; je ne chercherais pas à leur dérober quelques vieux jours, qui ne vaudraient pas le soin que je prendrais de les mettre à l'abri; à mon âge il faut mourir pour le tombeau le plus voisin afin de s'épargner la lassitude d'un long voyage. J'aurais pourtant bien du plaisir à visiter les forêts que j'ai parcourues dans ma jeunesse, et à recevoir votre hospitalité.

Agréez, monsieur, je vous prie, avec mes remerciements, l'assurance de ma considération distinguée.

Chateaubriand.

GILBERT CHINARD.

Johns Hopkins University.

Mystères et Moralités du manuscrit 617 de Chantilly. By GUSTAVE COHEN. [Bibliothèque du XVe siècle, vol. XXV.] Paris: Champion, 1920. Pp. cxlix + 138.

Additions to the literature of the early French drama have been so rare in recent years and modern editions so few that one cannot but welcome a volume containing five hitherto unpublished old French plays, an early *Nativité,* a fragment of another *Nativité,* a *Moralité des sept Péchés Mortels et des sept Vertus,* a *Moralité de l'Alliance de Foy et Loyalté,* and a *Moralité du Pèlerinage de la Vie humaine.* The collection, written in a Walloon dialect conjectured to be that of the region north-east of Liège (p. cxlvii), emanates, as the editor has cleverly discovered (p. xcviii f.), from a convent of the Dames Blanches de Huy, where some at least of the plays were performed. The manuscript is dated from the second part of the fifteenth century, but the plays in the opinion of the editor seem to belong, with the exception of the first *Nativité,* to the second half of the fourteenth (p. cxlviii).

The first *Nativité,* if one excludes the scene introducing two shepherdesses,[1] bears every evidence of being a very early play. The

[1] This scene is partly out of place in the MS. and paleographically distinct. The hypothesis (p. x) that the same scribe who is responsible for the rest of the play wrote it—*en des modules différents*—seems unlikely. The dissimilarity between I, ll. 1-98 (scribe A), 99-111 (B) and 112-121 (C) extends beyond the *modules.* A writes the article *unc,* B and C *ung.* A writes *nos* or n^9, *vos* or v^9, B only no^9, vo^9, C only *nos.* A writes *enfan* seven times, never *enfant,* C only *enfant* (twice). A wrote "Chi aorent les pastore Et puis chantēt Glorieux dieu etc" which B crossed out, rewriting the same rubric later as "Chy adorent les pasteurs 7 puys chantent glorieux dieu qi fist."

It is also to be noted that the signatures of plays I and V, which induced the editor to adopt the theory that the whole MS. is the work of only two scribes writing in at least six different *modules* (p. x), are after all not identical. Remembering that the family Bourlet was "très liée à la vie du couvent" (p. xcix) and that Katherine's sister Ydon also entered it, is it not possible that the latter, or some other Bourlet, may have signed the first play? The question is not without importance for if, for example, I, ll. 99-121 are an addition to an earlier play, then discussions involving their vocabulary, assonances and date (pp. xvi, xxvi, lxxxiv, cxxv) should take cognizance of this possibility.

editor gives it (p. cxxi) a "double certificat de provenance liégeoise et d'ancienneté" and dates it (p. cxlviii) not later than the first half of the fourteenth century. His arguments, however, for connecting it with the liturgical Bilsen *Stella* and the vernacular *Paaschspel* are unconvincing. In the case of the Bilsen text, he apparently forgets at times that the antiphon *Hoc signum* on which he lays such stress (p. cxvii f.) is not present in the Bilsen *Stella;* he overemphasizes the importance of the agreement in the use of *offeramus* for the more usual *offerentes,* a slight, possibly scribal, detail; and he underemphasizes the relation of the new text to the Strasbourg, Limoges and Vatican texts in the position of the *Eamus ergo,* a structural matter.[2] In the case of the *Paaschspel,* the only significant resemblance is the presence of the *Hoc signum,* clearly a liturgical survival in both plays; the *Eamus ergo* occurs before the meeting with Herod in the *Paaschspel,* after it in the *Nativité.* In fact the Limoges text agrees with the *Nativité* more closely than either the Bilsen play or the *Paaschspel,* for it alone has all three of the distinguishing characteristics stressed by M. Cohen. In any event, however, the connection of this newly printed Nativity play with the liturgical drama cannot be questioned, and the editor is quite justified in stating (p. cxxxi) that its simplicity, sincerity and absence of comedy distinguish it from other early French plays on the subject.[3]

The second *Nativité,* fragmentary, later, and of less interest than the first, is nevertheless noteworthy for the appearance of a *Sot,* introduced as a sort of court jester to King Herod. Both these plays exhibit peculiarities of assonance and rhythm—if their eccentric *vers libre* can be called rythmical—that deserve further study.

The three moralities which follow gain such distinction as they

[2] The Vatican text is not mentioned, and to speak of the "usage tardif" of Limoges is misleading: whatever the date of the office, its form is primitive. There are several minor slips on this page (cxviii): for *Martenne,* read *Martène;* for *après que les rois ont quitté les Mages,* read *après que les Mages ont quitté le roi.* "Le manuscrit 178 d'Orléans" is now Bibl. de la Ville 201 (olim 178) and Paris Bibl. Mazarine ms. 1708 is attributed to saec. XI, not XIII, by its editor. On these points see K. Young, *Mod. Lang. Notes,* XXVII (1912), 68-70.

[3] He says (p. cxxxii) that it is probably "la plus ancienne Nativité connue en langue vulgaire." The Spanish Three Kings play (*Auto de los Reyes Magos*) now dated by R. Menéndez Pidal (*Cantar de Mio Cid* [1908], p. 144) before the thirteenth century, is not mentioned.

possess from their literary and historical associations rather than from any intrinsic merits of their own. The first is an uninspired development of the *Psychomachia* type, but will be of considerable interest to students of the drama because it illustrates the intimate connections existing between the mediæval plays and their non-dramatic sources. M. Cohen rightly surmised that the words *Le miroir de vie . . . et de mort* in ll. 2527-8 "pourra servir à en découvrir la source," but the source itself eluded him. The play, however, is based upon a moral poem which is entitled *De vij pechies morteus,* or, *Li miroirs de vie et de mort* in the Bibl. Ste. Geneviève Ms. containing it (Ms. 2200 f. 164v-172v; it is briefly described by Mâle in *L'Art religieux du XIII^e siècle,* p. 145).[4] The third morality printed by M. Cohen is also derived from a moral poem, the well-known *Pèlerinage de la vie humaine* by Deguilleville, of which it is for the most part a direct translation. As the editor has flanked the play by two texts of the poem, written in fourteenth-century French and fifteenth-century Walloon, respectively, its linguistic and literary problems can be conveniently studied. The other morality included in the volume (Play IV) introduces an unusual pastoral element — the characters, Foy, Loyalté, Amour, etc. appear as shepherds and shepherdesses. In the opinion of the editor (p. cvii f.) the play may contain historical and social allusions, but, as he admits, their proper interpretation is attempted rather than achieved.

Unfortunately, the long Introduction discussing certain paleographical, linguistic, historical and literary aspects of the plays, despite its formal air of completeness and orderliness, leaves much to be desired. Philologists will be on their guard when they find (p. xix) *infier:siewy,* III, 2136-7 cited (and again p. xxxvii) as illustrating the reduction of *ie* to *i,* although it is clear from the text that *infier* is rhymeless and that *siewy* rhymes with *cy,* l. 2138; when in the group *ire:premire:banier,* III, 207-9, it is assumed that l. 209 rhymes with 207-8; when such rhymes as *Sainte-Espire: vestire, cy:my, roÿne:encline,* are described as "important" and

[4] Since writing this review I have learned, through the kind offices of M. Jeanroy and Dr. D. S. Blondheim, that M. Långfors has anticipated me in recognizing the relation of the play to the poem. M. Långfors' edition of the poem is to appear in *Romania,* where the subject will doubtless be fully discussed.

"characteristic"; when (p. lv) the second vowel in such words as *angele, ordene,* etc. is treated as "*protonique* non initiale non en position," etc. The justification for the plan of grouping together the rhymes and assonances "qui trahissent des prononciations identiques et cela sans égard ni à l'étymologie ni à la graphie" (p. xx) becomes obscure in the execution.[5]

The absence of a careful study of elision and hiatus in the Introduction has laid the texts under a needless burden of notes,[6] and in many cases where the editor holds printed debates with himself in the footnotes no recognizable general principles appear to guide his decisions. It would seem, especially in play v, where the two texts of the *Pèlerinage* printed beside it usually suggest the correct reading, that the corrections obviously demanded should either have been introduced, properly indicated by brackets and parentheses, or omitted without further comment than that supplied by an introductory discussion.[7] It is also to be regretted that, owing to

[5] Thus among the "assonances et rimes en *ei*" (p. xxviii f.) one discovers such forms as *aueuglit* : *delit,* III, 79-80; *nettie* (*nettoyée*) : *deslechie* (*déliée*), III, 2269-70 which is cited on p. lxxvii as attesting "la réduction de *ie* à *i*"; etc. The rhyme *vray* : *dyraie,* III, 59-60 is placed among the assonances and rhymes in *ei* (p. xxix), and *diraie* : *vray,* IV, 37-40 (read 37-8) among the assonances and rhymes in *ai, è, eal* (p. xxiv), while *seroie* : *voroye,* III, 1305-6 appears among the assonances and rhymes in *oi* (p. xli). Among the "assonances et rimes en *o*" which "ne sont explicables que si on les suppose en *o*" (xxxix-xl) are *jour* : *doleur,* III, 1635-6; *doleur* : *pleur,* III, 1641-2; *amor* : *solour,* III, 2297-8, and *Amor* : *labeur,* IV, 298-9, all four of which are also included (though similar examples are not) among the "assonances et rimes en *eul, eur, ure, our*" (xlv-xlvi), where considerable uncertainty is expressed regarding their pronunciation.

[6] The discussions of the treatment of final *e* on pp. xiv, lv f., lxxii, are inadequate. Cf. e. g. the two statements on p. lvi: "Il faut en conclure probablement que l'*e* final, dès le XIVe siècle et à la différence du français, ne se prononce plus. . . ." and "La suppression de l'*e* muet s'effectue souvent aux dépens de la mesure. . ." What seems to have happened in these texts, if one may hazard a conjecture, is that since etymological final *e* was *sometimes* not pronounced, it was occasionally omitted without justification, and, on the other hand, an unetymological *e* was at times introduced, in accordance with the familiar phenomena of inverted ("umgekehrte") writing and pronunciation.

[7] See such notes as III, 252, 312, etc; v, 29, 31, 81, 99, etc. and cf. e. g. III, 672 with 1175; III, 2019 with 2023, etc. The wisdom of suggesting elision by parentheses may well be questioned, but in any case the inde-

the general plan, hypotheses regarding the dates and authorship of the various plays, as well as references to the relation between the language of authors and scribes are scattered here and there through the Introduction in such a way as to render them practically inaccessible.

These are technical details, however, and for general students of the mediæval drama of less importance than the texts themselves. Here, then, they will find a miscellaneous collection of plays which were probably performed as well as transcribed by nuns, two of the plays early and characteristically Walloon in spirit as well as in form, two adapted with but few changes from non-dramatic moral poems and all worthy of study because of their provenance as well as their possible literary relations at home and abroad.

GRACE FRANK.

Baltimore.

A Survey of English Literature, 1780-1880. By OLIVER ELTON. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920. Four vols.

The first two of the four imposing volumes of Professor Elton's new work appeared in 1912, have therefore been subjected to their share of reviewing, for the most part favorable, and have already for nine years served efficiently their purpose and proved their worth, by no means small, in the world of scholarship. Since, however, the author has added to these volumes two more of the same size, over 400 pages each, and has extended the period treated from 1830 to 1880, the reviewer can hardly ignore the original volumes and give his attention only to the new ones, but is obliged, in the circumstances, to consider the whole work, old and new, as an organic unity.

To cover with efficiency one hundred of the most prolific and revolutionary years in English literature is an impressive under-

cision between *q(ue)* and *qu(e)*, *q(ui)* and *qu(i)*, *passim*, should have been avoided. Inconsistencies in the use of brackets, parentheses and italics, as well as discrepancies between the notes and text, are not infrequent (III, 144, 2214, 2470; V, 170; III, 2493; III, 295, V, 190, p. 11, note*, p. 20**, p. 81*, etc) and the many references of the type "Voyez, sur ce vers, l'Introduction" (III, 499, 1078, etc.) satisfy the conscience of the editor rather than the curiosity of the reader.

taking, even for a group of scholars, but when the task is accomplished single-handed, the display of so much courage, industry, and breadth of judgment demands our highest respect and admiration, and in this case something more—even our gratitude. Others have given the history of certain types of literature for longer periods than that of Mr. Elton's work; Professor Saintsbury has covered in two volumes in a more cursory manner the period from 1780 to 1860; and a group of scholars in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* have treated with the advantages and serious disadvantages of division of labor the period in question. Without belittling the merits of other and previous works in the same field, I am convinced that Mr. Elton has given us results much to be desired—a certain organic unity with component parts seen in their proper perspective, and minor ones not forgotten; a consistent intelligent following by a master mind of the continuity of development which makes no break with the period prior to 1780, admits no interruption in the period discussed, and comes to no clearly marked boundary in 1880. In fact, Professor Elton's healthy respect in the first few pages of his work for the early years of the eighteenth century at once commands our attention and wins our confidence. These years, he informs us, until 1780 are distinguished by the ascendancy of prose. The "reunion of poetry and prose under the rule of the free imagination is the great mark of our literature from 1780 to 1830."

In the first volume (p. 393), in a discussion of the official reviewers, the author recalls Edward Copleston's ironical advice to the young reviewer—"to work chiefly upon the preface of the book that he is noticing, for there he will discover 'a fund of wealth lying upon the surface'; and, above all, to find fault." With little inclination to find fault, though not unmindful that Mr. Elton prefers (III, 116), hard hitting after the manner of Macaulay to "the vague praise, or the cautious innuendo, which now often does duty for criticism," we do, on the other hand, feel impelled to heed well the limitations of this work as outlined in the Preface, to regret that the historical and biographical aspect has been kept well in the background, and that foreign influences have been but lightly touched; but to regard with pleasure the motto from Hazlitt on the title-page of the first edition, unfortunately forgotten in the new,—"I have endeavoured to feel what is good, and to give a reason for the faith that was in me, when

necessary, and when in my power." Like Matthew Arnold, with whom he is on the best of terms in this work, Mr. Elton as a critic is after the best that has been thought and said. So intent is he on bringing this to light, so broad is his conception of what English literature includes, or rather, shall we say, so imbued is he with what we might term a German mania for exhaustiveness, that few prominent minds within the period, regardless of the field of their mental activity, fail to find a place in his pages. Economists, political thinkers, orators, divines, scientists, reviewers, explorers, philosophers, critics, scholars, historians, nondescripts, and a whole galaxy of minor writers form the vast background of the great picture well in front of which, in due order and with proper emphasis, are clearly portrayed the prominent figures in English literature for the hundred years in question. If the author has not gratified our taste for foreign influences, he has at least made us realize the complicity of the domestic influences that are constantly acting and reacting on the subject-matter of any literature—influences that are too frequently lost to view in our intense search for the ancient, the foreign, and the remote. To expect that Mr. Elton or any one else can speak with authority or finality on each of the multitude that throngs his pages is too much to hope, but we are amazed at the dexterity with which he puts each in his place and rounds up his contribution to the realm of thought.

In the four volumes the author has loaded every line with ore, for the most part of his own mining. We are constantly impressed with the evidence of fresh original investigation, the fruits of sound scholarship and mature judgment. With absolute propriety we may say of Mr. Elton as he has said (III, 295) of Sir Leslie Stephen, "he delivers endless judgments in a brief Tacitean manner without a touch of arrogance." Not infrequently he pauses to weigh and set aside a long-accepted verdict in criticism, occasionally but not often accepting some popular view that should long ago have been forgotten. When, for instance, he states that Burke "detests first principles, derides pure analysis, and uses 'metaphysician' as a term of contumely" (I, 228), and joins with Buckle in taking for granted in Burke's later years "the unsettling of his saner judgment" (I, 239), we cannot agree without some qualifications. He is also too much concerned over "the Wordsworth who was to harden into a far stonier conservatism than

Scott's, and who lost, as Lord Morley has said, his interest in progress about the date of Waterloo (II, 73). Such assertions malign Wordsworth's better fame quite as much as the following statement, made without the light of Professor Harper's recent investigations, shields the regretable event of his life: "And for self-reproach, as we have said, he has no remedy at all in his wallet; he never had serious occasion for it (II, 96). We, too, should like to dismiss "with satisfaction" the "spectral old scandal of Byron to the limbo of things unproven" (II, 161), and perhaps may yet be able to do so. Shelley must not be too harshly taken to task for a deficiency of remorse and self-reproach when we recall his repudiation of remorse and his determination to have none of it, although we can never know how well he succeeded:

> Reproach not thine own soul, but know thyself,
> Nor hate another's crime, nor loathe thine own.
> It is the dark idolatry of self,
> Which, when our thoughts and actions once are gone,
> Demands that man should weep and bleed and groan;
> Oh vacant expiation! Be at rest.—
> The past is Death's the future is thine own.[1]

Keats's "Bright star," as Sir Sidney has recently proved,[2] was not "the last of his poems, written on his voyage, under the shadow of death and the memory of unfulfilled love (II, 238). Neither do we believe that Keats in the expression of his preference of romance to the death-day of empires in the beginning of the second book of *Endymion* "puts the case in a young petulant way which delights us, and is merely true to youth, and romance" (II, 240); for we recall Browning's *Love among the Ruins,* which our author praises highly but misinterprets (III, 376), with its concluding line, "Love is best." We remember, also, in this connection those earnest words of Mr. Colvin penned during the dark days of the late war: "And when the future looks back on to-day, even on to-day, a death-day of empires in a sterner and vaster sense than any the world has known, will all the waste and hatred and horror, all the hope and heroism of the time, its tremendous issues and catastrophes, be really found to have eclipsed and superseded love as the fittest to fill the soul and inspire the songs of the

[1] *The Revolt of Islam,* 8, 22.
[2] Sir Sidney Colvin, *John Keats,* 1917, pp. 492-3.

poet?"[3] In his criticism of Browning's poetry our author at least once is tempted into a certain grotesqueness of statement, a fault of Browning which he does not allow us to forget, and quite overlooks the true significance of the poem in question. "*The Flight of the Duchess,*" he writes, "is an expression of the longing for escape which is heard in *Youth and Art,* or in the tale of Jules and Phene. Go off to the gypsies, like the Duchess, or to a garret and live on love, or to 'some unsuspected isle in the far seas!' Go with your mate, your lover, and damn the consequences, for 'God's in his Heaven!'" (III, 371). Browning, if we mistake not, was more intent on ridiculing that from which the escape was made than in defending the escape. He had in mind a fad then too common in England of attempting to restore the lifeless customs of a dead past because they were thought aristocratic. Our author also seems to forget that this poem is put in the mouth of an eccentric character.

But to attempt to record all of the points on which we disagree with Mr. Elton is futile. They are few and widely scattered compared with those on which we are in accord, and perhaps are still fewer compared with those on which we have no decided opinion, and about which we are content to learn from his words of wisdom. For the most part we feel that he brings his message fresh from his reading; only now and then betraying a too implicit reliance on memory, as for instance, in his account of Landor's *The Empress Catherine and Princess Dashkof* he mistakes Dashkof for Catherine's lover (II, 36); or makes Browning's Ivàn Ivànovitch kill his own wife instead of Dmìtri's (III, 389); or has Eppie in *Silas Marner* chance "on the discovery of the long-murdered body" (IV, 268); or supposes the son in Byron's *Werner* really falls in love with the daughter of the victim (II, 167); or when he quotes Pope's line on Defoe as "Earless, on high, stands unabashed" (II, 138), instead of "Earless on high, stood unabash'd," as Pope wrote it.

Professor Elton is a critic with strong convictions, but not with prejudices. He approaches his subject with no passionate attachments to defend or inveterate antipathies to revenge. His remarks are everywhere characterized by the spirit of fairness, the desire

[3] *Idem.*, p. 183.

to present the truth with no personal bias; by a conservatism that seldom betrays him into such a sweeping and doubtful assertion as: "He [Byron] has affected the spirit of poetry more than any modern man except Shakespeare and Goethe, and on the whole he has deserved to do so" (II, 181); by an inclination to find as much merit and praise as possible; and by no eagerness to linger over faults and scandals. His estimates strike home with a brevity and felicity of expression that startle and please.

The work is very readable, inspiring while it instructs, in a style that is terse, lucid, occasionally tinged with humor or irony, but never carried beyond the bounds of scholarly accuracy on a tide of unrestrained enthusiasm. We have found nothing in the work better than the chapter on Blake; we believe the author more at home with Tennyson than Browning, with Thackeray than Dickens; and admire without applauding his defence of Byron, Macaulay, and Arnold; while we suspect he does not entirely catch the purport and spirit of Carlyle and Newman. On the whole we prefer the first two volumes to the last two, but should not care to lose any. We regret that the valuable notes at the end of each volume did not find a place at the bottom of their respective pages where they would be more serviceable, and that the author did not give us a separate bibliography instead of burying it in his notes. It is to be hoped that in the next issue of the work the separate indices in volumes II and IV will be combined. On the whole this is an excellent, much needed work that will not soon be superseded.

L. N. Broughton.

Cornell University.

The American Novel. By Carl Van Doren. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921.

Mr. Van Doren's work is not a series of biographical and critical studies of more or less eminent American novelists. It is, as it professes to be, "a chapter in the history of the American imagination." The term *novel* is consequently interpreted as including "long prose narratives in which the element of fact is on the whole less than the element of fiction," and the method is historical rather than critical. The result is the most valuable contribution

made in recent years to our apparatus for the study of American fiction.

Five of the ten chapters into which the book is divided deal with periods and tendencies: the romance that preceded Cooper, with its three subjects—the Revolution, the Settlement, and the Frontier; Cooper's successors in the romance of adventure; the blood and tears of the dime novelists and the domestic sentimentalists; an account of the rich variety of the productive decade 1880-1890; and a discussion of two reactions from realism—rococo romance toward the right and naturalism toward the left. Interspersed among these are chapters which bear the names of individual authors, who thus emerge as the great names in the history of the American novel. They are Cooper, Hawthorne, Mark Twain, Howells, and Henry James. The preëminence of these five will be conceded by most readers; and Mr. Van Doren's comments on them will be found to be informing and acute. He reminds us that Cooper, whom fate chose to be "the principal romancer of the new nation," showed a tendency toward realism that is sometimes overlooked. "Cooper," he says, . . . "is not to be neglected as an historian. No man better sums up in fiction the older type of republican — rather than democrat — which established the United States. No one—unless possibly Irving—fixed the current heroic conditions of his day more firmly to actual places." Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter,* with which the American novel reached its maturity of art and which remains our supreme example of literary skill, Mr. Van Doren discusses convincingly. His comment on Howells and the realism of which he is our most notable exponent is illuminating. The distinction of writing the first American novel which may be called realistic in a modern sense belongs, he says, to Colonel John W. De Forest of Connecticut for his *Miss Ravenel's Conversion from Secession to Loyalty.*

Howells Mr. Van Doren regards as the most democratic of novelists. "Fenimore Cooper and Hawthorne, both Democrats, could still never leave off complaining that democracy lacks the elements of saliency and color upon which they thought the prosperity of the novelist depends. What his predecessors shrank from, Howells ardently embraced, thoroughly satisfied to portray the plain universe which lay before him . . ." The "sudden, almost explosive, fame of Mark Twain," for which *The Innocents Abroad*

supplied the match, culminates, in the opinion of Mr. Van Doren, in *Huckleberry Finn,* a "glorious" book, which he contrasts with *The Scarlet Letter* as its only possible rival for first place in our fiction. It is a glorious book, in spite of its looseness of structure; and its value as a social satire—its portrayal of slavery from a contemporary point of view, for example—is not always recognized. It is not so much hatred of kings that is the first article of Mark Twain's creed as hatred of every kind of oppression and a blazing espousal of the cause of the under dog. Witness his exhibition of the cruel futility of the Kentucky feud. But his picture of slavery in the little river town is tempered by an understanding of the institution as it actually existed.

Mr. Van Doren's style is agreeable, free from the smartness of paradox, and lighted by whimsically fresh and compact phrasing. He is probably not aware of an overuse of that latest fashion in tropes, *gesture;* we have Pathfinder's "grandiose gesture of surrender," a "gesture of sentimental asceticism" in Fanshawe, and Henry James's conception of "a romantic American gesture quaintly like that of Daniel Boone," which on the same page becomes "this ingratiating gesture." In both style and matter, however, the book is eminently satisfying. It whets the appetite for that promised further volume in which the same author proposes to discuss fully the American novel of the twentieth century.

JOHN C. FRENCH.

The Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE

La Galerie du Palais[1]

(1) I did not overlook "the lack of liaison between scenes 9 and 10 of Act I." As Dorimant and Lysandre go off to "dîner ensemble," Hippolyte and Florice come on, returning from the Galerie. There is no lack of liaison. (2) My omission of M. Roy's name was quite unintentional. (3) I cannot agree with Professor Lancaster that the author of the *coup d'essai* (102) must be the same as the imitator of Marino (100). The text, far from indicating this, indicates exactly the reverse. In line 98 the Libraire offers Dorimant *two* books, not one. Obviously one of them is by the imitator of Marino; and Dorimant having rejected it scornfully, the Libraire, *referring to the other,* says:

> Ce fut son coup d'essai que cette comédie.

---

[1] Cf. *MLN.* XXXVI, 427-430.

I do not profess to have proved that the date is 1633. I do suggest, however, that the internal evidence supports this date, or, in any case, does not invalidate it; and, as to the external evidence, there seems to be none whatever to suggest 1632 rather than 1633. That line 105 refers to Corneille himself seems substantiated by the poem quoted on p. xlvi. Moreover, the year 1633 fits in well with the suggestion that the imitator of Marino is Saint Amant, although Théophile would fit in almost as well, possibly, and Malleville even better than either. The assumption of 1633 as the date of the *Galerie,* the assumption that the "coup d'essai" is *Mélite* and that either Saint-Amant, Tristan, or Malleville is the imitator of Marino, fit in together. The triple assumption makes an hypothesis, which is not contradicted by any *facts* that have come to light.

T. B. Rudmose-Brown.

Trinity College, Dublin.

A Reply

1. Professor R.-B. evidently confuses *liaison des scènes* with unity of place; there is certainly no *liaison* between these scenes. 3. I repeat that there is no reason for assuming that in this passage Corneille had any special play or author in mind. He was writing what his audience could understand; he was not interested in creating puzzles for future philologists. But if he did have some one in mind, it is far more likely to have been Scudéry than himself, for the person to whom he refers is accused of imitating Marino. Professor R.-B. seeks to avoid this difficulty by explaining that two *authors* are referred to, but the *son* of line 102 must refer to the person discussed in the preceding line. This is not only my interpretation, but that of several Frenchmen to whom I have submitted the question. Professor R.-B.'s whole argument falls to the ground with his misinterpretation of this construction and there remains no reason for believing that the play was written in 1633 rather than 1632.

H. C. Lancaster.

Milton's *Comus,* 93-94

In *Mod. Lang. Notes* xxxv, 441, and xxxvi, 414, Professor John A. Himes puts aside all the usual interpretations of "the star that bids the shepherd fold" in Milton's *Comus* 93-4, on the ground that the "evening star (or planet) does not at folding time appear at 'the top of heaven'." He proposes for the single star the constellation Leo (with its bright star Regulus), because "in May, the critical month for flocks, the constellation Leo is in the zenith shortly after sunset." He adds, "as the lion, ac-

cording to Homer (*Il.* x, 485, and often), is the menace to flocks, the appearance of the constellation is a warning to shepherds." Mr. Himes makes no reference to a use by any writer, ancient or modern, of the constellation Leo as "the star that bids the shepherd fold," or explains in any way such definite references to Vesper and the shepherd's folding his flocks as in the pseudo-Virgilian *Culex* 202-5, Spenser's *Virgil's Gnat* 313 ff., or other passages of similar import in classical or English poetry. He had not perhaps seen my article in *Anglia* xxxix, 495 ff.

To that article, and as further tending to show that Milton's "top of heaven" was not so impossible for poetry of the time, I may now add one other reference in Spenser, Milton's master. In *F. Q.* i, ii, st. 6 he placed "Hesperus in highest skie," as he had placed the same star "in top of heaven sheene" in *F. Q.* iii, iv, st. 51. For similar inaccuracies of Milton and others, see the article above mentioned.

"The star that bids the shepherd fold" is naturally the shepherd star. What would seem to be conclusive proof of the meaning of that term, at least in Elizabethan times, may be added from another source. In 1591 Thomas Bradshaw published a book with the title

The Shepherds Starre/ NOW OF LATE SEENE and/ at this hower to be observed merveilous orient/ in the East: which bringeth glad tidings to all/ that may behold her brightness, having/ the foure elements with the foure Capitall/ Virtues in her, which makes her/ Elementall and a vanquisher of all/ Earthly humors.

The book was dedicated to the Earl of Essex and Thomas Lord Burgh, baron of Gainsborough, and was entered in the *Stationers' Register* Apr. 29, 1591. The author was in the Netherlands with the English regiments which helped Henry IV of France, but a letter of his brother Alex. Bradshaw is prefixed to the book and dated Apr. 23. The book doubtless appeared shortly after the later of these dates.

With the book itself, a lengthy paraphrase of the third *Idyl* of Theocritus, we have nothing now to do. But the allusion to the shepherd star "at this hower to be observed merveilous orient in the east" can be no other than one to the morning star of the time, a star then displaying unusual brilliancy. Now the morning star in March and April 1591, as I am informed by our Naval Observatory at Washington, was Mars, which was then approaching opposition and becoming very brilliant. Venus and Saturn were evening stars at the time, and Jupiter was in the zenith at midnight. Nor is there any evidence of any comet, new star, or other similar phenomenon which could have been in the mind of

the author of the *Shepherds Starre*. Without question the shepherd star of Bradshaw was the morning star of the time, the unfolding star of poetry. It is a natural inference that the shepherd star connected with the folding of the sheep was Venus, or the evening star of the period, no matter how careless the poet may have been in placing it in the sky, during ages none too careful about references to the external world.[1]

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

Western Reserve University.

"Under the sonne he loketh"

Commentators, so far as I know, have been unable to find any occurrence of this idiom except in the well-known passage in *The Knight's Tale,* line 839:

> And whan this duk was come unto the launde,
> Under the sonne he loketh, and anon
> He was war of Arcite and Palamon.

Every reader doubtless conjectures that the words mean nothing more than that Duke Theseus looked all round, turning from one point of the compass to the other, and that the expression must have been a current and popular one when Chaucer wrote. But, if so, why have not other occurrences of the idiom been found? Did it die out after Chaucer's time?

It would seem to have died out in the more standardized forms of written speech but to have been preserved in the popular ballads, which of course reproduce oral speech. In *Bewick and Graham,* which is ballad number 211 in Child's collection, one stanza of the eighteenth-century version runs:

> He lookd between him and the sun,
> To see what farleys he coud see;
> There he spy'd a man with armour on,
> As he came riding over the lee.

This is only an approximation of the expression, however. Better examples occur in two versions of *Fair Annie,* number 62 in Child's collection, one of which has recently been found in North Carolina, the other in Virginia. The North Carolina version, taken down

[1] Proof of the *Anglia* article above never reached me, and some misprints occur, most of them easily corrected. Two or three references are misleading, since page references to my MS. were used instead of the corresponding pages of the article when printed. Thus, on page 507 the reference at end of line eight should be p. 500; in footnote 3 the reference should be to p. 497; on the footnote to p. 508, it should read p. 500.

by the English balladist, Cecil J. Sharp, from the singing of Mrs. Jane Gentry, of Madison county, has as its second stanza,

> She took her spy glass in her hands
> And out of doors she went;
> She looked to the East, West, both North and South,
> And looked all under the sun.

The Virginia version was sent to me only a few days ago by Mr. John Stone, of Albemarle county. He took it down from the singing of Mrs. Martha Elizabeth Lethcoe, of Washington county. Stanza five in her version is,

> She lookèd east, she lookèd west,
> She looked all under the sun;
> And she saw Lord Thomas
> Bringing his bridal home.

These examples prove, I think, that Chaucer, as conjectured, meant nothing more than that Duke Theseus looked all round, literally boxed the compass, before he saw Palamon and Arcite; but the provisional conjecture has become a practical certainty. They prove also that, though the expression may have left the shores of Great Britain, though it may be disdained by the pen of the scholar, it lives on the tongue of the plain people in our own Appalachian mountains. Do they not hint also, if they do not prove, that a rich field of unharvested syntax is still awaiting the investigator of these English and Scottish ballads, especially in their American survivals?

C. Alphonso Smith.

U. S. Naval Academy.

A Lost Play by Alexandre Hardy: *La Follie de Clidamant*

In Professor H. Carrington Lancaster's edition of the *Mémoire de Mahelot, Laurent et d'autres décorateurs de l' Hôtel de Bourgogne* (Paris, Champion, 1920, p. 73) is reproduced the stage-setting of a lost play by Alex. Hardy: *La Follie de Clidamant.* The text reads as follows: "*La Follie de Clidamant, de Mr Hardy:* Il faut, au milieu du theatre, un beau palais; et, a un des costez une mer, ou paroist un vaisseau garny de mats et de voiles, ou paroist une femme qui se jette dans la mer; et, a l'autre costé, une belle chambre qui s'ouvre et ferme, ou il y ait un lict bien paré avec des draps; du san."

These properties fit, in the main, a story narrated in a *Roman à clef* which was very popular in the first decades of the seventeenth century, *La Polyxène* by François Hugues de Molière d' Essertines, first printed in 1623:[1] It bears the title: *Histoire de Cloryman,*

[1] About the murder of Molière d' Essertines, the two continuations of his *Polyxène*, etc., see Lachèvre, *Bibliographie des Recueils Collectifs.* About his relations to Camus, Bishop of Belley, see Bayer, *J. P. Camus und seine*

d' Isménie et de Polyxène, and is found chiefly at the end of Book II and the beginning of Book III. In Book I already Molière d' Essertines depicted the love of Isménie for Cloryman, who loves Polyxène. Isménie's jealousy makes communication difficult between Polyxène and Cloryman. A strategem is invented: Ardanil, a servant of Cloryman pretends to be mad (p. 102 *sq.*) and, while raving, he communicates his master's messages to Polyxène. Isménie is forced by her father, the King of Syria, to marry Alceste, son of the King of Cilicie (p. 347). She embarks on a ship with prince Alceste, but jumps into the sea and is believed dead. Cloryman, meanwhile, arrives in Armenia at the house of a knight, Alcidor, where he finds Isménie. It soon is explained (p. 414 *sq.*) that she had been rescued by pirates and, after two days of imprisonment on board their vessel, had been delivered by Alcidor, the Armenian knight. Cloryman escapes with her, and, accompanied by his "Domestique" Mélandre, reaches an island. But Mélandre is false to his master. He falls in love with Isménie, and one night he tries to kill Cloryman in his bed. After this deed, he abducts Isménie and embarks on a ship (p. 447 *sq.*). On board, however, they meet Damastée, a knight in disguise, who consoles and protects the forlorn Isménie until they meet a ship from Cilicie which captures them. Damastée makes public the crime committed by Mélandre, who is arrested and condemned to death. Isménie, blaming all her misfortone on her beauty, disfigures herself [2] but even then she is still attractive enough to be brought to Prince Alceste, who is still mourning her. After a reconciliation, she marries him. Cloryman, having recovered from his wounds, comes back at the time of her marriage, and meets her secretly in a temple. Soon after that she dies.[3]

If Hardy had staged this story, the palace could have been used for the first part of the play: the rivalry between Isménie and Polyxène for Cloryman, with the madness scenes of the servant Ardanil. The ship from which a woman jumps into the sea fits the attempted suicide of Isménie. The palace again could have served for the scenes in the Chateau of the Armenian knight. The bed and the blood could have been used to stage the attempted murder of Cloryman by the unfaithful Mélandre, while the last scenes, the meeting of Isménie with the Prince Alceste in his palace, could have been played again in the "Beau palais" of Mahelot's stage setting.

This possible identification of the source of Hardy's play hardly accounts for the title: *La Follie de Clidamant.* Could it refer to

Romane. For the contemporary noblemen whose adventures he is supposed to narrate, see Drujon, *Les Romans à Clef.*

[2] This is a reminiscence of the *Astrée,* in which Celidée disfigures herself, *Histoire de Celidée, Thamire et Calidon.*

[3] The meeting in the temple is another reminiscence of the *Astrée.* Celadon also hides in a Temple.—Cf. vol. I.

the ravings of Cloryman's servant, who is pretending to be mad at the beginning of the story? Or can it be supposed that Hardy would have introduced the customary scene of the ravings of a character who believes he is dead and in the company of ghosts and gods? He would have had an occasion for the introduction of such a scene during the recovery of the wounded Cloryman. That he had a preference for such outbursts of real or supposed madness can be seen by the titles of two other of his lost plays: *La Folie de Turlupin* (*Mém. de Mahelot.* Ed. H. C. Lancaster, p. 70) and *La Folie d'Ysabelle* (*id.*, p. 74). In either case, however, Hardy would have given to his play a title drawn from a secondary episode in his story, which is not his custom.

It is possible, on the other hand, that Hardy's play is based on another story containing incidents similar to those of de Molière's *Polyxène*. In such case the suggestion made here may be a step toward its discovery.

Gust. L. van Roosbroeck.

University of Minnesota.

[Mr. van R. accounts for the scenery and properties mentioned. As the notices referring to Hardy's plays are often incomplete, the omission by Mahelot of a second palace is not a serious difficulty. He does not, however, explain the title, for the name Clidamant does not appear in the novel, nor is the hero of it mad. If there were a larger number of properties mentioned and identified, this objection would be less serious. As it is, I can only say that, although this is the best identification that has been proposed, the evidence is not altogether conclusive.—H. C. L.]

Etymology of *Burlingame* (*Burlingham*)

Burlingham is the older, and historically the more correct form. The type of formation is identical with that of *Buckingham*. The third and last element is OE. *hām* 'home.' The first element is not, as might at first sight appear, OE. *būr* (*[ge]būr*) 'farmer,' ModE. *boor*. Bardsley cites (p. 149) *Hugh de Byrlingham, Hundred Rolls*, 1273 A. D. OE. *ū* never yields MidE. *y*. It is OE. *byr[e]le* 'cupbearer, tapster.' The second element is the patronymic and diminutive suffix *-ling* 'son of.' The word *byrling* (*burling*) therefore means 'cupbearer's or tapster's son, little tapster, bar-boy.' Although cited in no Dictionary, it must nevertheless have existed, for the modern form *Burling* is fairly common. It is barely possible that the name *Burling* is identical with *burling* cited by Murray, but this is unlikely. *Byrlingham* (*Burlingham*) therefore means *Home of the Byrlings, Home of the Bar-Boys.* The final *-e* was added in the 14th century to indicate that the preceding vowel was long. Compare *Cunningham(e)*.

The word *byr[e]le* is of unusual interest. It means literally 'bear-er,' *byr* being derived from *ber-an* 'bear,' and *-le* functioning

as *suffix agentis.* A *byr-le* was a man who tapped or drew or poured wine or beer and 'bore' and served it to the patrons of his tavern. The *byr-ling* was his son, the bar-boy. The denominative verb *byr[e]lian,* formed with the *-jo* suffix, meant originally 'to act as *byr[e]le.*' Bosworth-Toller defines it 'pour out, give to drink, serve.' Murray cites occurrences of the word in *Beowulf* (before 1000 A. D.), and in Aelfric (about 1000). The word was therefore brought to England from the Continent by the earliest Anglo-Saxon invaders. The following citations by Murray are of interest: *Wyclif* c 1380—Thei drinke . . . and birlan it to othere men. *Lanc. Gloss.* 1875—'Birl out th' beer.' Murray defines the noun *birle* 'one who pours out a drink; cupbearer, butler;' and the verb *birle* 'to draw or pour out (drink).' The *English Dialect Dictionary* defines the latter: 1. to pour out liquor, to pass round, to ply with drink. 2. to drink hard, to carouse. The verb is still current in the vernacular of the North of England and Scotland.

Burlingham is the form of the name invariably used in England. It is pronounced *Búrling-um,* with a heavy stress on the first syllable. Due to the lack of stress on the last syllable, the *h*-sound disappeared, and, in America, the letter with it. With *Burling-ham Burling-hame Burling-ame,* compare *Cunning-ham Cunning-hame Cunning-ame,* and *Farn-ham Farn-am Farn-um.* Despite the change of spelling, *Burling-ame* is still pronounced *Búrling-um* in Philadelphia, Baltimore, and the South. But in New England and New York, where the name is rather common, due to the influence of the written form, popular etymology has been at work, the result being that the name is divided and pronounced *Burlin-game,* or *Burling-game,*—a species of *game! Cunning* (from *cyn[in]g* 'the knowing one, king') saved *Cunning-hame!*

Albany, N. Y. E. W. BURLINGAME.

References:—C. W. Bardsley, *Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames,* p. 149; H. Harrison, *Surnames of the United Kingdom,* vol. 1, pp. 58-59; Bosworth and Toller, *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary,* sub vocibus *byrle, byrlian;* Murray, *New English Dictionary,* sub voce *birle; English Dialect Dictionary,* sub voce *birle.* On final *-e,* see Skeat, *Principles of English Etymology,* First Series, p. 310.

BRIEF MENTION

The Hound of Heaven: An Interpretation, by Francis P. LeBuffe, S. J., Professor of Psychology, Fordham University, Graduate School (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1921). The popularity of Francis Thompson's remarkable poem has a background that may be represented by H. D. Traill's exclamation: "A 'public' to appreciate 'The Hound of Heaven' is to me inconceivable" (Everard Maynell, *The Life of Francis Thompson,* 1913, p. 144). Mr. Maynell then adds: "Mr. William Archer, a splendid appre-

ciator, expressed much the same view." But the context indicates a change in the color of the light thrown upon that background: "Yet in the three years after Thompson's death the separate edition of 'The Hound of Heaven' sold fifty thousand copies; and, apart from anthologies, many more thousands were sold of the books containing it." As to another aspect of Thompson's rightful recognition, it will be noticed that the author of the 'Interpretation' which is the subject of this notice disproves by his professional badge the continuance in Catholic circles of that neglect of the poet lamented by Canon Sheehan in 1889 (Maynell, p. 143). And, to keep this observation within narrowest limits, it will be remembered that the Rev. J. F. X. O'Conor, S. J., published 'A Study' of the poem in 1912 (N. Y., John Lane Co.).

Mr. Archer's earlier judgment of the poem was afterwards revised in his more complete study of the poet (*Poets of the Younger Generation.*—The Prefatory Note is dated 1901). "But the first thing to be done," says Mr. Archer, "and by far the most important, is to recognize and declare that we are here face to face with a poet of the first order—a man of imagination all compact, a seer and singer of rare genius. . . . If ever there was a born poet, a poet in spite of himself, who lisped in metaphors for the metaphors came, this surely is he. His worst faults proceed from excess, not from defect, of poetic endowment." Mr. Archer moreover places the poet in the company of the mystical poets, and in his explanation of this association finds its basis in Thompson's catholicism. "How comes it, then," he writes, "that a poet who sees the material universe so intensely and, up to a certain point, so intrepidly, should, when that point is reached, plunge into the theological mysticism which speaks in *The Hound of Heaven* and *To the Dead Cardinal of Westminster,* in *Assumpta Maria* and *Any Saint,* and in a hundred incidental passages throughout his work? The explanation, I think, is not far to seek. Catholicism is Mr. Thompson's refuge from Pantheism, a creed, or rather a philosophy, too cold to satisfy the poet within him."

Caution is always to be administered in the study of a poet's theology. Some poets are, of course, strictly orthodox; others conceal various degrees of heterodoxy under the venerable and glowing symbolism of orthodoxy. The poets of the second class, thru the adopted symbolism, inevitably invite an interpretation favorable to a canon of convictions that in a too restrictive sense hems in the poet's freedom of thought. Joyce Kilmer and Father Tabb clothe the symbols of the Church in fresh, imaginative beauty, but they do this with completely sincere acceptance of indoctrinated belief. Thompson may be read under the same assumption, but that reading is probably not completely correct. In the last strophe of the poet's *Orient Ode,* for example, Mr. Archer does not recognize "the evangelical Christ"; he holds that the symbol visualizes a force less dogmatically conceived.

On the other hand, Father LeBuffe analyzes the poem in all its details into the elements of common personal experience and expounds it in accordance with traditional exegesis. Not assuming that in "this endeavor of the soul to make away from God" we are to read definite incidents in the poet's experiences, he confidently declares: "What is of interest and what secures the widest appeal for the poem is that it is autobiographical of 'a' soul, in aspects common to it and all mankind, and therefore autobiographical of *every* soul." In commenting on the fleeing and the pursuit, the industrious and earnest exegete avails himself of Scripture and a wide survey of literature, and offers the results of years of study and meditation bestowed upon the poem. Scripture, of course, supplies the chief portion of what is drawn into the notes so pertinently as to impress the reader with the commentator's skilful selection and his power of persuasive interpretation. Citations from the poet's other compositions have an authenticity of their own; and the measured, illustrative stress put upon them will win approval for the citations from Tennyson, Wordsworth, Shelley, O'Shaugnessy, Trench, Robert Southwell, W. H. Mallock, Sidney Lanier, Coventry Patmore, Father Ryan, Father Tabb, C. Scollard, and Joyce Kilmer. Saintly authors make their contribution, St. Augustine, St. John Chrysostom, St. Francis Xavier, and Thomas Kempis; and there are references to Homer, Æschylus, Aristotle, Virgil, and Dante. One observes that Father LeBuffe has apparently overlooked Mr. Paul Elmer More's reference to Æschylus' *Erinnys* (*Shelburne Essays,* 7th ser., 1910, p. 163), which is especially interesting for a suggestion pertaining to the title of the poem,—a title that the poet has not seen fit to introduce into the text at any point.

Father LeBuffe has composed so complete a commentary on the poem (pp. 27-89) as to leave for no grade of readers any possible questions unanswered. Besides, he has taken occasion to intersperse good preachments, and these will at least not harm any reader. A partial view of the various character of the Notes may be indicated. Thus, as to the poet's 'Grammar of Assent,' a few lines may be taken from the Note against line 60, *Their Angel plucked them* etc.: "Did Thompson have in mind here the story of Ganymede of pagan mythology, and of Habacuc (Daniel xiv, 32-38)? He certainly had in mind the Catholic belief in Guardian Angels." And the Note against *dead sanctities* of line 86 contains this: "Compare the opening verses of 'Orient Ode,' wherein Thompson bases his imagery on the Catholic ritual of Benediction." So in the rather obscure lines 152-154 a question is asked the answer to which would contain "the whole doctrine of mortification, so grossly misunderstood by many,"—a doctrine of which "Thompson had quite a singular grasp. . . . He puts it tersely in 'Any Saint.'" The thought is also illustrated by quoting Tennyson's

> That men may rise on stepping-stones
> Of their dead selves to higher things.

Less pertinent, if pertinent at all, is the inference drawn from line 82 that the poet had in mind a "parallel between the seasons of the soul and the Church's liturgical seasons."

The commentator is not daunted by the poet's "profuseness of metaphor" in lines 136-140, but proceeds to show that there is "no confusion" here. Explanatory clauses are: "the fitful shower merely moistens the dust and does not sink into and fructify the earth."—"The efforts of youth are wont to be spasmodic and unstable." But less obvious is the metaphor of the *broken font,* which "is taken from a broken, discarded well over which hangs a gaunt, stark tree from whose soughing branches the bleak wind spills down into the stagnant waters below the drops of rain which seem to ooze out of the branches." From the desolate and depressed mind are distilled *tear-drippings* and *dank thoughts* from its *sighful branches,* "and these fall into a heart that has lost all motion, suffering that dreadful paralysis that comes from excessive sorrow." In submitting this interpretation it is added: "We need not press the word 'branches' to find a strict parallel in the mind. It merely fills out the picture, indicating that there was no quarter of the mind that offered anything but sadness and depression."

One more Note shall be cited to show the commentator's gentle and reflective observation of common experience, and also his manner of distinguishing a mere suggestion. Of lines 70-72, he observes "The meaning seems to be, that in the early hours, before the turmoil of life taints the earth, Nature's children drink of the dews which come pure and clean and sparkling (*lucent-weeping* = pouring forth light) out of the morning's chalice." And the good story is added, that Corot "used to fold up his kit at sunrise and go into the house, saying that beauty vanished with the broad daylight."

Surely more has been cited than would be sufficient to characterize Father LeBuffe's sincere and pains-taking task of interpreting the poem which has been so highly praised, with however the tacit admission (one must assume) that some lines are too mystical or figurative for exact analysis. The reader will regard the commentary instructive thru its illustrations of the thought drawn from Scripture, from Thompson's other poems, and from the authors enumerated above. Additional references for the symbol of the 'Love-Chase' have been supplied in *The Mystical Poets of the English Church,* by Percy H. Osmond (S. P. C. K., 1919),—a book in which a short section is devoted to Thompson. This has not been noticed by Father LeBuffe; nor has he paid any attention (if, as Professor of Psychology, he has been aware of it), to Thomas Verner Moore's psychoanalytic study of the poem (*The Psychoanalytic Review,* vol. v, 1918). Here the point-of-view is

strictly autobiographical, and the discussion is to demonstrate "the distinction between *libido* and control," whatever the value of the demonstration may be.

J. W. B.

No very definite principle seems to have guided Mr. T. R. Smith in his compilation of the anthology of Swinburne's "Poems" issued in "The Modern Library" (Boni and Liveright). There is still room for a satisfactory anthology of Swinburne. The poet's own selection, issued so long ago as the eighties, was a distinct disappointment; William Sharpe's Tauchnitz collection, besides devoting disproportionate space to a reprint of "Atalanta in Calydon" entire, wasted so much of the remainder upon Swinburne's *juvenilia* as to draw forth a protest from the poet himself; the "Selected Poems" published by Messrs. Harper is a mere reissue of "Poems and Ballads" with the addition of barely enough other material to justify the altered title-page; the selection in the Belles-Lettres Series edited by Mr. W. M. Payne, in some respects admirable, in the laudable effort to emphasize the work of the poet's maturity, disregards the earlier poems to an extent that conceals the importance and the brilliance of Swinburne's first phase. The present collection goes to the opposite extreme, and devotes nearly two-thirds of the contents to a selection from "Poems and Ballads," including not only the great obvious things but many poems of little worth except as they tend to justify the advertisement, put by the publishers upon the paper cover, of Swinburne as representing "the world of the flesh." "Cleopatra," which a frank friend told Swinburne was "a mere farrago of commonplaces of his earlier style" and which the poet himself never reprinted, is here given a place of honor. While various vagaries of a juvenile and not very healthy imagination are reprinted, the splendid lyric of genuine passionate experience "At a Month's End" is not given, And what shall be said of a collection that omits "Ave atque Vale," "The Last Oracle," "The Pilgrims," and "Master Triumphalis"? There are excerpts from "Atalanta" and one chorus from "Erechtheus"; but "Tristram of Lyonesse" is entirely ignored. The publishers' claim that "each poem is printed complete" is contradicted by the fact that of "By the North Sea" only one section, and that not the best, is given. To quarrel with the makers of anthologies is generally to trespass upon ground concerning which there is no disputing; in this case, however, it is not merely the question of taste that is at issue. We are glad to hear that Mr. William Heinemann intends to publish shortly what will, we trust, be a more representative volume of selections from Swinburne's poems.

S. C. C.

129

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVII MARCH, 1922 NUMBER 3

THE DATIVE OF TIME HOW LONG IN OLD ENGLISH

As is well known, in West-Saxon Time How Long is usually denoted by the accusative case, as in *Matthew* 20. 6: Hwi stande ge her *eallne dæg* idele = Quid hic statis *tota die* otiosi? At times, however, in West-Saxon and somewhat more frequently in Northumbrian, duration of time is expressed by the dative case, as in Ælfric's West-Saxon translation of *Exodus* 12. 19: Ne beo nan gebyrmed mete *seofon dagum* on eowrum husum! = *Septem diebus* fermentum non invenietur in domibus vestris;[1] and in the Northumbrian *Lindisfarne Gospels, Matthew* 20. 6, which has the dative instead of the accusative of the West-Saxon translation above given: hwæt her stondes ge *allen dæge* idlo? = quid hic statis *tota die* otiosi? It was the relative frequency of the use of the dative to denote time how long in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* observed while studying that text for another purpose, that led me to take up my present theme, the Dative of Time How Long in Old English, especially in the Northumbrian Dialect.

On turning to our standard English grammars, such as those by Koch, Mätzner, March, Mueller, Sweet, and Wülfing, I was surprised to find that, while the fact is stated that the dative is sometimes used in West-Saxon to express duration of time, little or no explanation of that fact is offered. Nor in the treatises dealing more or less directly with the syntax of the Northumbrian Dialect of Old English did I find any explanation suggested of this idiom. Accordingly I set out in search of an explanation myself.

[1] As noted by Mätzner, in his *Englische Grammatik,* II, p. 175, in *Exodus* 12. 15 the accusative is used in a similar passage: And etað ðeorf *seofon dagas* = *Septem diebus* azyma comedetis.

Whether or not my quest has been successful, must be left to the decision of my readers.

To begin with the West-Saxon, Eduard Mätzner, in his *Englische Grammatik* (3rd ed., Berlin, 1880-1885), Vol. II, pp. 174-175, merely says: "In Beziehung auf Zeitbestimmung bezeichnet der Akkusativ—der Raumbestimmung analog—das Erstrecken durch einen Zeitraum, und wird daher zunächst zum Ausdrucke der Zeitdauer auf die Frage: wie lange? . . . Neben dem Akkusativ steht aber der Dativ in gleicher Bedeutung im Angelsächsischen: And etað ðeorf *seofon dagas* (Exod. 12, 15); dagegen: *Seofon dagum* (12. 19). Ne mæg eow nan ðing wiðstandan *eallum dagum* ðines lifes (Jos. 1, 5)." In each of the two examples from the Ælfrician *Exodus* just quoted by Mätzner the Latin original, not given by him, has a durative ablative (*Septem diebus* azyma comedetis and *Septem diebus* fermentum non invenietur in domibus vestris), as also in the example from *Joshua* (Nullus poterit vobis resistere *cunctis diebus* vitæ tuæ).

C. F. Koch, in his *Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache* (2nd ed., Cassel, 1878), Vol. II, p. 92, § 112, states that "Der Dativ bezeichnet die Zeit, wann die Thätigkeit geschieht;" he gives examples of the Dative of Time When in Old English; and adds an example of the dative expressing "Zeitdauer: He wæs *micelre tide* wunigende, Bed. 3.7." The corresponding Latin, not quoted by Koch, again has an ablative (in Hibernia non *parvo tempore* demoratus). Koch says nothing of temporal relations in his discussion (in Vol. II, p. 93, § 113) of the Dative of Measure.

In his *Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen* (Bonn, 1894), J. E. Wülfing does not treat separately the Dative of Time When and the Dative of Time How Long, nor does he segregate his examples of the former use from those of the latter. He merely says, in Vol. I, p. 143: "Der adverbiale Dativ dient zur Angabe der Zeit, wann, auch häufig: wie lange, wie oft (*) etwas geschieht," and then gives his examples, without separating the one use of the dative from the other. Moreover, as he himself indicates, his statistics are by no means complete. Nor does he say anything of temporal expressions in his discussion, in the same volume, p. 144, of the Dative of Measure.

While gratefully making some use of the incomplete and unclassified examples of Wülfing and of the statistics of other inves-

tigators mentioned later, I have been forced to gather statistics of my own not only for Alfred but for other writers, also. For the preparation of this paper I have read statistically the following works:—(1) for West-Saxon: *Beowulf,* edited by A. J. Wyatt (Cambridge, 1908); *Two Saxon Chronicles Parallel,* edited by Charles Plummer (Oxford, 1892); *King Alfred's Orosius,* edited by Henry Sweet, Part I. Old English Text and Latin Original (London, 1883), which has numerous temporal expressions; *The West-Saxon Gospels,* in the four-volume edition by Professor James W. Bright (Boston, 1904-1906), with the Latin original as given in Wordsworth and White's briefer edition of the *Nouum Testamentum* (Oxford, 1911); Ælfric's partial Translation of the Old Testament, with the Latin Original, both edited by C. W. M. Grein[2] (Cassel and Göttingen, 1872);—(2) for the Northumbrian: the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (and for comparison the *Rushworth Gospels*), with the Latin Original, all edited by W. W. Skeat[3] (Cambridge, England, 1871-1887).

The Dative of Time How Long falls, it seems to me, under two larger subdivisions, which I shall venture to denominate (A) the Quasi-Durative Dative of Time and (B) the True Durative Dative of Time. In Type A, the Quasi-Durative Dative, the dative gives the time of one event by referring to another event either antecedent or subsequent thereto, and of necessity expresses at once both time when and time how long, as in these examples from *Orosius*:—44.3: Ær ðæm ðe Romeburg getimbred wære *IIII hu[n]de wintrum & hundeahtatigum,* Uesoges, Egypta cyning, wæs winnende of suðdæle Asiam . . . & . . . wæs siððan mid firde farende on Sciððie on ða norðdælas = *Anno* ante Urbem conditam *cccclxxx,* Vesoges, rex Aegypti, meridionem et septentrionem aut miscere bello, aut regno jungere studens, Scythis bellum primus indixit;—208. 22: Æfter ðæm ðe Romeburg getimbred wæs *DC wintrum,* . . . wearð Romanum se mæsta ege from Sceltiuerin =

[2] The full title runs: *Ælfrik de Vetere et Novo Testamento, Pentateuch, Iosua, Buch der Richter, und Hiob.*

[3] The full title runs: *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions, Synoptically Arranged with Collations Exhibiting All the Readings of All the MSS.; together with the Early Latin Version as Contained in the Lindisfarne MS., Collated with the Latin Version in the Rushworth MS.*

Anno ab Urbe condita *DC,* . . . cum Romanos ingens Celtiberorum metus invasisset, etc. No example of Type A has been found in the Northumbrian. In Type B, the True Durative Dative, the extent of time occupied by an event is expressed without reference to any other event, as in these examples:—*Genesis* 3. 14: God cwæð to ðære næddran . . . ðu gæst on ðinum breoste and etst ða eorðan *eallum dagum* ðines lifes = Et ait dominus deus ad serpentem: . . . super pectus tuum gradieris et terram comedes *cunctis diebus* vitæ tuæ;—*Lindisfarne Luke* 15. 29: heono feolo uel *menigum gerum* ic hero ðe = ecce *tot annis* seruio tibi (Rushworth: lacking; W. S.: *fela geara*).

Having defined and given general illustrations of the two types of the Dative of Duration of Time, let us now look at each for a moment by itself and try to discover more precisely the nature and the origin thereof.

As to the nature of Type A, the Quasi-durative Dative of Time, some scholars hold that the dative is a dative of measure, and denotes degree of difference much as the ablative does in Latin. Mätzner, for example (*l. c.,* Vol. II, 1880-1885, p. 181), in discussing the Denotation of Measure, says: "Das Mass, um wie viel ein Gegenstand von einem anderen im eigentlichen oder bildlichen Sinne übertroffen wird oder hinter ihm zurückbleibt, wird durch den Akkusativ bezeichnet. Dies geschieht namentlich beim Komparativ der Adjektive und Adverbien und bei dem von *too* begleiteten Positiv, so wie bei Verben, welche einen Komparativbegriff enthalten, wie *überbieten, vermehren, vermindern,* u. dgl. . . . Im Angelsächsischen stand zum Theil der Instrumentalis beim Komparativ zur Angabe der Differenz, daher ðy (ðe) *læs,* ðy *wyrse,* ðy *bet;* vgl. *eo minus.* Longe *hu* geornor (the longer the more welcome) (Cod. Exon. 110, 18). Daneben der Dativ, wie bei dem Komparativen *ær: Fela wintrum ær* (Sax. Chr. 1054)." Similarly Oskar Erdmann, in his *Syntax der Sprache Otfrids* (Halle, 1874, 1876), Vol. II, § 273, after discussing the Instrumental Case Denoting Cause, speaks thus of the Dative of Measure (including the Temporal Dative): "In ähnlicher Weise steht einigemal bei Zahlangaben der Dat.-Instrumental zur Bezeichnung des Masses, um welches eine Grösse die andere übertrifft; das Mass der Unterscheidung kann leicht als Grund derselben aufgefasst werden. So bei Zeitdifferenzen: IV, 2, 5 *sehs dagon* fora thiu. IV, 4, 3: thaz

was *finf dagon* er = *sechs, fünf Tage vorher,*" etc. This statement by Erdmann is substantially adopted by W. Wilmanns, in his *Deutsche Grammatik,* III, 2, p. 613 (Strassburg, 1909), who, in discussing the Dative of Measure, refers to Erdmann, and quotes two of his temporal datives; and by Otto Mensing, who, in his *Grundzüge der Deutschen Syntax* (Stuttgart, 1898), Vol. II, p. 274, says: "Der Dat.-Instr. dient ferner zur Bezeichnung des Masses oder der Differenz bei Zahlangaben;" and who, also, quotes Erdmann's Temporal Datives. Finally, so far as the Dative with a Comparative Adjective is concerned, the Erdmann theory is accepted by Professor B. Delbrück, who, in his *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen,* Vol. I (Strassburg, 1893), § 125, speaks as follows of "Der Instrumentalis bei Komparativen": "Bei Komparativen erscheint ein sog. Instrumentalis des Masses, dasjenige bezeichnend, um welches ein Gegenstand einen anderen übertrifft. . . . Über das Germanische s. Grimm 4, 751. Im Got. ist noch die Instrumentalform *þe* in *þe* haldis eo amplius erhalten, ahd. diu halt." Personally I have always considered that the Dative-Instrumental with the comparative of adjectives denotes, as is claimed by all the writers just quoted, degree of difference substantially as does the ablative with a comparative in Latin. And it is possible to consider that in my Quasi-durative Dative of Time with verbs we have a dative denoting degree of difference, just as Dr. A. W. Ahlberg, in his *Durative Zeitbestimmungen im Lateinischen* (Lund, 1906), p. 68, considers that the Latin ablative denoting time with *ante* and *post* is an ablative of measure rather than an ablative of time when. The fact that measure is often expressed in Old English by the dative-instrumental might seem to justify that view.

But I doubt whether the Quasi-durative Dative was so felt or considered by the Anglo-Saxon writers. On the contrary, I believe that it was felt to denote time when rather than time how long, and for two reasons. First, at times we find the Quasi-durative Dative and the Accusative of Time How Long in one and the same sentence, as quoted below, in which it seems to me that the writer purposely uses the dative to designate time when and the accusative to denote time how long. Observe these examples:—*Orosius* 56. 14, 15: Ær ðæm ðe Romeburg getimbred wære *xxgum wintrum* Lædemoniæ & Mesiane, Creca leode, him betweonum winnende

wæron *xx wintra = Anno vicesimo* ante Urbem conditam Lacedaemonii contra Messenios propter spretas virgines suas in solemni Messeniorum sacrificio, *per annos viginti* bellantes, ruinae suae totas Graeciae vires implicuerunt;—*Oros.* 110, 14, 16: Ic sceal hwæðre eft gewendan ðæt ic hwelcnehugu dæl gesecge Alexandres dæda; & hu Philippus his fæder *IIII hund wintrum* æfter ðæm ðe Romeburg getimbred wæs, he feng to Mæcedonia rice on Crecum, & ðæt hæfde *XXV wintra = Anno* ab Urbe condita *CCCC,* Philippus, Alexandri pater, regnum Macedonum adeptus, *viginti quinque annis* tenuit. Secondly, in most of the examples of the Quasi-durative Dative in *Orosius,* the Old English dative translates a Latin ablative, singular, of time when.

Sometimes, however, possibly out of analogy to the categories above treated, we have a West-Saxon dative of duration translating a Latin accusative of duration, as in this example from *Orosius*:—164. 10: Cartaina . . . Sio wæs getimbred from Elisan ðæm wifmen, *lxxiitigum wintra* ær Romeburg = de Carthagine, quae ante urbem Romam *duos et septuaginta annos* ab Elisa condita invenitur.—At times, too, in *Orosius,* we seem to have, in one and the same phrase, one of the numerals in the durative dative and the other in the durative accusative, as in 36. 22: Ær ðam ðe Romeburh getimbred wære *eahta hund wintra & fif wintrum,* gewearð ðæt Moyses lædde Israhela folc of Egyptum = *Anno* ante Urbem conditam *dcccv* etc.

Whatever may be the final decision as to the ultimate nature of the Quasi-durative Dative of Time in Old English, there can be little doubt that this dative is of native origin in Old English, for we find it frequently in the *Chronicle,* occasionally in Wulfstan, and often in Ælfred and in Ælfric.

In the True Durative Dative of Time, Type B, as stated at the outset, extent of time is expressed by the dative instead of, as normally, by the accusative, and the time of the event is given without reference to another event, as in these examples:—W. S. *Luke* 1. 75: ðæt we . . . him ðeowian on halignesse beforan him *eallum urum dagum* = ut . . . seruiamus illi in sanctitate et iustitia coram ipso *omnibus diebus nostris* (Lind.: dative; Rushw.: dative);—W. S. *Luke* 18. 4: Ða nolde he *langre tide* = Et nolebat *per multum tempus* (Lind.: ðerh *menigo uel miclo uel feolo tid;* Rushw.: ðerh *monige tide*);—*Ælf. Gen.* 3. 17: on geswincum ðu

ætst of ðære eorðan *eallum dagum* ðines lifes = in laboribus comedes ex ea *cunctis diebus* vitæ tuæ;—*Ælf. Levit.* 8. 33: Ne fare ge *seofon dagum* of ðære stowe durum = De ostio tabernaculi non exibitis *septem diebus.*

Concerning the origin of the Durative Dative in Type B, in Old English, I have seen no expression of opinion. One might be inclined to suppose that it is a natural evolution from Type A; that, to take an example already used for another purpose (*Orosius* 44. 3, p. 131 above), Ær ðæm ðe Romeburg getimbred wære *IIII hu[n]de wintrum & hundeahtatigum,* Vesoges, Egypta cyning, wæs winnende might lead to some such locution as Vesoges, Egypta cyning, wæs winnende *IIII hunde wintrum & hundeahtatigum,* a time-when-time-how-long dative thus becoming a time-how-long dative only. And Type A may have occasionally led to such a development.

Again, the use of the dative to express time how long may in part have arisen in temporal expressions in which only one event is referred to and in which the dative, being modified by an adjective denoting measure (*eall, long, micel,* etc.), may, at times almost indifferently, be considered to express time how long as well as time when,—a suggestion for which I am indebted to Dr. Ahlberg's *Durative Zeitbestimmungen im Lateinischen,* p. 27. After quoting Catullus 109. 5-6 (ut liceat nobis *tota* producere *vita* Aeternum hoc sanctae foedus amicitiae), Dr. Ahlberg comments as follows: "Also: bei dem Catull treffen wir zum erstenmal in der lateinischen Litteratur den durativen Ablativ. Es verdient besondere Beachtung, dass dies gerade in einer Zeitbestimmung mit dem Attribute *totus* der Fall ist. Denn, wenn irgendwo, muss in derartigen Adverbien der Übergang vom Akk. zum Abl. fast unvermerkt sich vollziehen, weil der durative Sinn schon durch das Attribut *totus* deutlich genug hervortritt." As all the clearer Old English examples of the Durative Dative Proper observed by me have as modifiers an adjective of measure, one might be tempted to hold that, like the Latin, the Old English developed for itself the Dative of Time How Long out of analogy to the Dative of Time When modified by such an adjective, especially in view of the further fact that in a number of my examples of Type B, as is evident from those already quoted above, the dative wavers between the denotation of time when and that of time how long.

But, for reasons stated below, I must hold that the presence of an adjective of measure was only a slight factor in the development of the Durative Dative Proper in Old English.

The chief factor in the use of the dative to denote duration of time in Old English (both in West-Saxon and in Northumbrian) was the presence, in most instances, of a durative ablative in the Latin original. That this contention is probably correct is evident, I think, from these facts:—

1. In Old English poetry the true durative dative of time is almost unknown. Dr. E. Nader cites no instance of this use in his monograph on "Dativ und Instrumental im Beowulf" (Wien, 1883); nor have I found any clear example thereof in my own reading of this poem. Only one clear example (508: *widan feore*) is cited by Dr. Bruno Conradi, in his *Darstellung der Syntax in Cynewulf's Gedicht "Juliana"* (Halle, 1886). No example is given by Dr. Joseph Schürmann in his *Darstellung der Syntax in Cynewulf's "Elene"* (Paderborn, 1884), or by Dr. Alfred Rose in his *Darstellung der Syntax in Cynewulf's "Crist"* (Halle, 1890), or by Dr. Robert Dethloff in his *Darstellung der Syntax im Angelsächsischen Gedicht "Daniel"* (Rostock, 1907), or by Dr. Ernst Meyer in his *Darstellung der Syntaktischen Erscheinungen in dem Angelsächsischen Gedicht "Christ und Satan"* (Rostock, 1907), or by Dr. Oscar Hofer in his "Der Syntaktische Gebrauch des Dativs und Instrumentals in den Cædmon beigelegten Dichtungen" (in *Anglia,* VII, 1884, pp. 355-404), or by Dr. Friedrich Stieger in his *Untersuchungen über die Syntax in dem Angelsächsischen Gedicht vom "Jüngsten Gericht"* (Rostock, 1902), or by Dr. Karl Oldenburg in his *Untersuchungen über die Syntax in dem Altenglischen Gedicht "Judith"* (Rostock, 1907). In fine, only one clear example (*Juliana* 508:

> ic eall gebær,
> wraðe wrohtas geond werðeode,
> ða ðe gewurdun *widan feore*
> from fruman worulde fira cynne,
> eorlum on eorðan)

is cited in the monographs accessible to me on the syntax of Old English poetry; and that is in a poem known to be based on a Latin original.

2. The construction is practically unknown in the more original prose (the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and *Wulfstan*). I have found no clear example of a true durative dative in the *Chronicle,* but the accusative of time how long is very common therein. And of the 15 temporal datives listed by Dr. A. J. Daniels, in his *Kasus-syntax zu den* [*Echten und Unechten*] *Predigten Wulfstans* (Leiden, 1904), p. 65, several are quasi-durative datives, but none are true durative datives; while, again, the accusative of extent of time is so common that, after citing fifty examples thereof, Dr. Daniels merely writes *u. s. w.*

3. In the Alfredian translation of *Orosius* I have not found an indisputable example of the durative dative proper, though, as already stated in the earlier part of this paper, the quasi-durative dative is extremely common. This absence of the true durative dative is the more remarkable when we recall the fact that in the Latin *Orosius* there occur 46 examples of the ablative of time how long. These 46 ablatives are rendered as follows in the Old English translation: by a quasi-durative dative (292. 22),[4] 1; by an accusative of time how long, 40; by a prepositional phrase, 2; by nothing, 3.

4. In Late West-Saxon, however, the true dative of time how long begins to appear. In Ælfric's translation of the Old Testament, we find 8 examples, all[5] in direct translation of the Vulgate ablative of time how long. Of the remaining 132 examples of the durative ablative in that part of the Old Testament translated by Ælfric, 80 are rendered by an accusative of time how long; 25, by an adjective; 20, by a prepositional phrase; 5, by an adverb; 1, by an accusative object; and 1, by an accusative of extent of space. We have no example of a true durative dative in this text that is not directly due to Latin influence; but numerous examples of the accusative of time how long occur, occasionally in translation of a

[4] The example runs: He hæfde *vi gearum ær* onwald ofer ðа eastdælas = cum jam in Orientis partibus *sex annis* Gratiano vivente regnasset; and some may prefer to put it in Class B instead of in Class A.

[5] A possible exception occurs in the "Introduction" to *Judges,* l. 14: gesette him deman, ðe demdon ðam folce to swyðe langum *fyrste.* But I consider that *fyrste* is here governed by *to,* which latter I take to be a preposition, not an adverb.—The remaining eight examples are: *Gen.* 3. 14, 17; 8. 21;—*Ex.* 10. 23; 12. 19;—*Levit.* 8. 33;—*Jos.* 1. 5;—*Job.* I. 1[6].

Latin accusative of time how long (7), often in translation of other Latin idioms, and not infrequently without any Latin correspondent.—Dr. Bernhard Schrader, in his *Studien zur Ælfricschen Syntax* (Jena, 1887), p. 19, in treating the dative and the instrumental cases, speaks thus of their temporal uses: "Beide casus bezeichnen die zeit, in der etwas geschieht; meistens mit dem unterschiede, dass der dativ auf die frage, 'wie lange?' antwortet und dauer bedeutet, während der instrumental auf 'wann?' antwortend, mehr den zeitpunkt bedeutet." He then gives these three (and only these three) examples of the temporal dative in Ælfric's *Homilies*:—II. 286. 25: *Oðrum dagum* ðu underfenge me on minum limum, gyrstan-dæg ðu underfenge me on me sylfum;—II. 368. 35: Efne ic beo mid eow *eallum dagum,* oð gefyllednysse ðyssere worulde:—II. 490. 11: hi *ðrim dagum* ne onbirigdon ætes ne wætes, ac symle hrymdon and grimetedon for ðæm ormætum tintregum. But in the first of these three examples the dative seems to me to denote time when. In the remaining two examples the dative is durative, in the former of the two translating the Vulgate *Matthew* 28. 20, with its durative ablative: ecce ego uobiscum sum *omnibus diebus,* usque ad consummationem saeculi. —In the *West-Saxon Gospels,* the true dative of time how long is even less frequent than in Ælfric, only 4 examples occurring, 2 in rendition of a Latin ablative of time how long [6] and 2 in rendition of a Latin prepositional phrase.[7] Of the remaining 35 examples of the Latin durative ablative, 33 are turned by an accusative of time how long; and 2, by a prepositional phrase.

5. This thesis with reference to the true dative of time how long in West-Saxon is substantiated by the history of the idiom in the Northumbrian Dialect of Old English. In the *Lindisfarne Gospels* 22 examples occur of this durative dative,[8] each time in translation of a Latin durative ablative. But often the Latin ablative of time how long is rendered otherwise than by a durative dative: by an accusative of time how long, 16; and by a prepositional phrase, 1.—In the *Rushworth Gospels,* instead of the 22 examples of the true durative dative found in the *Lindisfarne*

[6] In *L.* 1. 75 and 20. 9.

[7] In *L.* 18. 4 and 23. 8.

[8] In *Mat.* 12. 40a,b,c,d; 20. 6; 28. 20;—*Mk.* 5. 25;—*L.* 1. 24, 56, 75; 2. 36; 4. 2, 25a,b; 8. 27, 29; 13. 11, 16; 15. 29; 20. 9;—*J.* 2. 12; 11. 6b.

Gospels, we have only 5 examples thereof[9] and 14 examples of the accusative of time how long, while three of the Lindisfarne examples are lacking in the *Rushworth Gospels.*

6. The thesis is substantiated, further, by the history of the durative dative in the kindred Germanic languages. To begin with the Gothic, Dr. M. J. Van der Meer, in his *Gotische Casus-Syntaxis,* I (Leiden, 1901), § 67, thus speaks of the dative of time how long in Gothic: "In een enkel geval, Luc. XVIII: 4 *laggai hweilai* = *ἐπὶ χρόνον,* geeft de datief antwoord op de vraag *hoe lang.* Hier zouden we dus een accusatief verwachten." This solitary example of a durative dative in Gothic is cited, too, by Heinrich Winkler, in his *Germanische Casussyntax, I. Der Dativ, Instrumental, Örtliche und Halbörtliche Verhältnisse* (Berlin, 1896), p. 69, and by Professor Wilhelm Streitberg, in his *Gotisches Elementarbuch* (dritte und vierte verbesserte Auflage, Heidelberg, 1910), § 257.—In Old Saxon the only durative datives that I find cited in the Germanic grammars are of Type A, as in the *Heliand,* l. 4199, quoted by Otto Mensing, in his *Grundzüge der Deutschen Syntax,* 2nd volume (Stuttgart, 1898), p. 274: Giuuet im thuo that barn godes innan Bethaniu *sehs nahton* er than thiu samnunga . . . uuerthan scoldi. With this, Sievers, in his edition of the *Heliand* (Halle, 1878), compares the Vulgate *John* 12. 1: Iesus ergo ante *sex dies* paschae venit Bethaniam. Many examples, however, are cited of the accusative of time how long in Professor Otto Behaghel's *Die Syntax des Heliand* (Wien, 1897), p. 165.—As to Old High German, the examples of the durative dative in the more original prose of Otfrid, as given by Oskar Erdmann, in his *Untersuchungen über die Syntax der Sprache Otfrids* (Halle, 1874, 1876), Vol. II, § 273, are exclusively of the A Type, as in IV, 2, 5: *sehs dagon* fora thiu quam er zi Bethaniu; IV, 4, 3: thaz was *finf dagon* er. These examples are cited, too, by W. Wilmanns, in his *Deutsche Grammatik* (Dritte Abteilung: Flexion, 2. Hälfte: *Nomen und Pronomen,* Erste und Zweite Auflage, Strassburg, 1909), p. 613. In Tatian, however, we find a few examples of Type B, the Durative Dative Proper, as in 4. 16: Thaz uzan forhta fon hentin unsero fiianto arloste thionomes imo in heilagnesse inti in rehte fora imo *allen unsaren tagun* = Ut sine timore de

[9] In *L.* 1. 75; 4. 2, 25a; 20. 9;—*J.* 11. 6.

manibus inimicorum nostrorum liberati serviamus illi in sanctitate et iustitia coram ipso *omnibus diebus nostris.* Of the temporal datives cited by V. E. Mourek, in his "Gebrauch der Casus im Althochdeutschen Tatian" (in *Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften,* Classe für Philosophie, Geschichte, und Philologie, 1897, Stück x, pp. 1-142), only two seem to me to denote time how long. Mourek does not segregate the datives of time when from the datives of time how long. He says that the temporal dative is only sparingly represented in Tatian, and cites, in all, only seven examples (exclusive of *simbulun,* which latter he considers a petrified adverb); whether these are all the examples of the temporal dative in Tatian or not, I do not know. In his treatment of the accusative of time how long, on p. 129, he cites about 25 examples of that construction in Tatian, and states that the Old High German accusative, in the majority of these examples, corresponds to some other construction in the Latin original. On looking up the Latin originals in Sievers's *Tatian,* I find that the correspondents of the Old High German durative accusative are as follows: an accusative of time how long, 12; an ablative of time how long, 11; an adjective, 1; a prepositional phrase, 1. C. W. Eastman's *Syntax des Dativs bei Notker,* a Leipzig dissertation of 1898, throws little or no light on our subject. The author speaks once (on page 53) of a Dative-Instrumental of Time, and cites two examples; and once (p. 59) he speaks of a Dative-Locative of Time, but cites no examples. In no one of the examples cited by Eastman of a temporal dative does the dative seem to me to denote time how long.

Despite the brevity of this survey, if the texts investigated by others and by myself with reference to the temporal uses of the dative in Old English (West-Saxon and Northumbrian) and in the kindred Germanic languages be considered truly representative, as I doubt not they will be, then this conclusion seems irresistible: the Quasi-durative Dative of Time (Type A) is a construction native to Old English and, probably, to the Germanic languages as a whole; but the True Durative Dative of Time (Type B) is a construction foreign to Old English and, probably, to the Germanic languages as a whole. For we find the former type in the more original prose, Old English and Germanic, while we find the latter type, as a rule, only in translations from the Latin, usually in

direct rendition of a Latin durative ablative of time. More than that: the durative dative proper never became naturalized in Old English (West-Saxon and Northumbrian) or, probably, in the Germanic languages as a whole: in each, time how long was habitually expressed by an accusative, not by a dative, even in translations of late Latin texts abounding in ablatives of time how long.

MORGAN CALLAWAY, JR.

University of Texas.

MORE'S *PSYCHOZOIA*

In general it may be said that during the reign of Elizabeth the conventional themes of medieval allegory, so familiar in poetry up to that time, began to be limited to the drama, and particularly to pageantry in the drama. What allegory we find in the poetry of the later Elizabethan years is in the main decadent. This is even more true of the early years of the seventeenth century, though there may be observed a new departure in the use of certain allegorical devices to interpret various of the newer scientific theories. Thus one finds in Fletcher's *Purple Island* whole passages of anatomical detail; such an attempt is made at scientific accuracy that what we have seems frequently like a versified text book on physiology, reminding us frequently that the theory of the circulation of the blood, for example, was still a novelty.

It is interesting, therefore, to find a poem which combines, together with undoubted references to contemporary science, at least seven of the most popular allegorical devices of the Middle Ages. Henry More's *Psychozoia,* first published in 1648, was the first of the *Philosophical Poems* which may be said to be the earliest publication of the great school of Cambridge Platonism. Written when More was about twenty-five years of age, the poem is a combination of frequently undigested learning based on the scholastic training of Cambridge, and a youthful enthusiasm for the newly discovered Plotinian philosophy in which More at that time believed that all contradictions were to be finally resolved. In the midst of what is admittedly a metaphysical study, sometimes nothing but a versification of portions of the *Enneads,* one comes across the pil-

grimage theme; the device of the marriage of abstractions; the figure of Alain de Lille's Nature; the contest of the Vices and Virtues; the assault of the castle of the soul; the debate; even the birds' matins.

In his dedication of the poem to his father, More says: "You deserve the patronage of better poems than these, though you may justly lay a more proper claim to these than any. You having from my childhood tuned my ears to *Spencers* rhymes, entertaining us on winters nights with that incomparable piece of his, *The Fairy Queen,* a poem as richly fraught with divine morality as phansy."[1] We are prepared from the beginning, then, for the many Spenserian reminiscences—even direct imitations and borrowings—which we find throughout *Psychozoia;* yet there are many themes in the poem which came rather from the medieval originals.

In the first canto More is dealing with one of the most difficult of all problems: the doctrine of the unity of the Trinity; and attempting, in addition, to reconcile the Christian and neo-Platonic doctrines of the Trinity; to prove, in other words, not only that the three are one, but that the Christian Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are paralleled by the Plotinian Good, Mind, and Spirit, or even that the one conception is included in the other. The allegorical form which he uses to express this complex idea is the marriage of abstractions. Ahad, or Hattove, variously spoken of as the Father and the Good, is represented as joining in marriage his children: Aeon, the Son, or the Mind, and Psyche, or the Holy Spirit. Ahad, the Father, being in his own nature infinite and incomprehensible, is represented as hidden in his own light:

> . . . deeply cover'd o're
> With unseen light. No might imaginall
> May reach that vast profunditie.[2]

Neither Ahad nor Aeon is, in himself, visible to mortal eye; they may be known only through the third person of the Trinity, Psyche; and Psyche herself is visible only through the robe of Nature which she wears. In his prolonged description of this figure, More is using that great medieval conception of Nature,

[1] *The Complete Poems of Dr. Henry More,* edited by Alexander Grosart. Chertsey Worthies' Library, 1878, p. 4.

[2] Cf. *Paradise Lost* 3, 376 ff.

suggested probably by Claudian in his *Rape of Proserpina,* but fully worked out for the first time, in Alain de Lille's *Complaint of Nature.* Upon the flowing robes of More's Psyche there are pictures which remind one of the pictures on the robe of the earlier Nature; but More has added to his figure a "number of goodly balls" which "pendant was at the low hem of this large garment gay"—most of which danced about, though one stood among them "steady"; "a glance," as he expresses it, "at Copernicus his system." Besides this More has added to the medieval description the fourfold robe, combined of Aristotelian elements: Physis, the outer robe, sprinkled with dark little spots which increase continuously, each developing to the full its own potentiality, yet never allowing the robe to lose that shape which is its nature; the second fold, Arachnea, a web "so thin as to deceive the spider's curious touch," in the midst of which sits the third element, Haphe, the sense of touch, these two together forming the life of sensation; the fourth fold, largest and loosest of all, spreading over and transforming all things, Semele, universal imagination.

It is through this four-fold robe that man can know Psyche, and it is through Psyche that he can comprehend the Trinity. Then the poet shows the union of the Trinity under the symbol of the marriage of abstractions, a device which in medieval allegory had its inception in the *De Nuptiis Philologiæ et Mercurii* of Martianus Capella, which we find used again and again throughout the Middle Ages. In addition to the marriage of Aeon and Psyche, More shows us the Father also placing his hand eternally upon the clasped hands of the Son and Spirit, with which action the union of the Trinity is accomplished.

From this macroscosmic allegory, More passes on, in the next canto, to a microcosmic one—the pilgrimage of the life of man. At first this tale, which is by far the most readable part of the *Philosophical Poems,* seems to have no connection with the first canto, but as the reader proceeds he finds that all souls are the children of Psyche, the great original source, each life on earth being a ray from the vast central sphere; the spirit, however, appears in as many guises as there are persons on the earth. The character through which More tells of the pilgrimage of life is Mnemon, who was a young man when the pilgrimage began, but whose years now number ten times ten—the Pythagorean symbol

of the perfect life.[3] The allegorical device of the pilgrimage, introduced into medieval allegory by the Latin Jean de Hauteville in his *Architrenius,* reached its climax — in extension at least — in Guillaume Deguilleville's *Pilgrimage of the Life of Man,* which has frequently been suggested as the source of Bunyan's allegory in the *Pilgrim's Progress.* Whatever the connection, it is interesting to note that More, whose books, according to Chiswell, the London bookseller, "ruled all London for twenty years after the Restoration," had earlier in the century written a pilgrimage allegory, which was undoubtedly widely read. Throughout the pilgrimage of Mnemon, the influence of Spenser upon More is evident to the most casual reader.

The scene of the pilgrimage is Psychania, the Land of Souls, which More describes as divided into two parts: the good, or the dwelling place of these souls which are most like God, is called therefrom Theoprepia; while the other part is Autaesthesia, the land of brute sensation. The one part is governed by the great angel Michael; the other by a giant, named Daemon, the father of all Discord, who is represented as cleft in two down to the waist. Daemon is married to "the wicked witch Duessa," from which hateful union there have been born two sons, who have been set by their father as rulers over the provinces into which his kingdom is divided: Philosomatus, the lover of the body, rules in the province of the brutish life; in Dizoia, the province of the dual life, rules Autophilus the lover of self. It is in the province of Beiron, the country of mere sensation, that the wandering of Mnemon begins. The first district in which he finds himself is Psittacusa-Land, the dwelling place of the parrot people, who speak significant words, the meaning of which they do not comprehend. On his way, Mnemon meets with other travellers, and for awhile they journey on together, in true allegorical style. The first of these, Don Psittaco himself, discourses glibly of all the problems of the universe

[3] It seems highly probable that the model for Mnemon and Milton's old Damoetas were the same—Joseph Mede, who was undoubtedly the best loved teacher of Cambridge while Milton and More, respectively the 'lady of Christ's' and the 'angel of Christ's' attended that college. The admonitions which Mnemon gives to the listening students in More's poem sound very much like the counsels which we read that Mede gave to his pupils before he dismissed them in the evening.

and says the last word in regard to each. Pithecus joins them for a short time, but rapidly proceeds to his own country, the land of the apes. It is while Don Psittaco is discoursing of religious forms and observances that there occurs that episode which is, from the point of view of allegory, one of the most interesting things in the entire poem, the birds' mass, an extraordinary device for this particular period. This carries us back historically to *La Messe des Oisaus* of Jean de Conde [4] of the early fourteenth century, in which occurs an elaborate parody of the church service, when Venus bids the nightingale to sing mass. The nightingale leads with the Confession, the larks take up the Introit, all sing the Litany; the nightingale sings the Gloria in Excelsis, the thrush reads the Epistle, the blackbird the Gospels, the nightingale the Creed, and the parrot preaches the sermon. The two principal treatments of the theme in English are to be found in Lydgate's *Devotions of the Fowles* [5] and *A Proper New Boke of the Armonye of Byrdes,* [6] sometimes attributed to Skelton. In *Psychozoia* More goes into details in regard to the setting of the matins, and then comments on the service as the birds perform it. The travelers crowd beneath a thick hedge and find before them a trimly kept close, with a raised grassy mound which is the altar of the birds. At either end stands a stately stalk of torchwort "whose yellow flames small light did cast abroad." The stump of a hollowed oak, now covered with moss, is the pulpit; the choristers, ordinary birds, occupy places on low-growing shrubs; the birds of more beautiful plumage sit on higher bushes; and above them all sits the eagle. The travellers do not remain for the entire service, but they do remark that each bird, as it enters the enclosure, bows to the east, that at various periods throughout the service, all the other birds do the same. After a song by the bird choir, the Pye, going up to the altar, bows low, then, flying to the hollow oak, thrice

> Bow'd down so low as if't had been's intent
> On the green moss to wipe his swarthy nose.
> Anon he chatters loud, but why himself best knows.

---

[4] Scheler, *Dits et Contes,* III, 1 ff.

[5] *Lydgate's Minor Poems,* ed. J. O. Halliwell for Percy Society, VII, 1840, pp. 78 ff.

[6] William Allen Neilson in his *The Origins and Sources of the Court of Love* devotes a chapter to the Birds' Matins.

At this the travellers leave the birds' church and take up their journey again. A short distance further on, they meet two friends of Psittaco, well named Corvino and Graculo—the description of whom is strongly reminiscent of Chaucer. There follows one of those 'debates' so common in medieval allegory and romance, in which the question is not however love, either earthly or heavenly, but is the conflict between the believers in rational and revealed religion. Eventually the discussion is ended, so far as Mnemon is concerned, by the fact that the travellers reach the crossroads; the others, still disputing, keep on in the kingdom of the brutish life, but Mnemon goes straight forward and comes at last to a high wall which completely bars his progress. This and what follows is definitely reminiscent of the *Roman de la Rose,* with its high wall and low wicket gate. Mnemon calls, and in answer there appears a youth, "in decent russet clad," who is Simon, or, as he explains it "obedientall Nature." He points out to the traveller that he has looked too high for the gate, "for that same doore where you must passe in deep descent doth lie." The wall, the traveller learns, is Self-Conceit; the low door, overgrown with stinging nettles, is Humility. Simon from this time becomes the guide usual to medieval allegory, explaining what else were dark to the traveller. Simon is accompanied by two strangely complex characters; his father, an old man, is represented as holding continually at his heart a bloody knife; his mother's back is bent beneath burdens, and her face distorted with pain. All three, we find later, are phases of the human soul, one being Patience, the other Self Denial, and Simon the complete soul which is in the end to include the others two.

The strange band passes through the gate of Humility and finds the valley of Dizoia, where all life is dual because man opposes his will to the will of God. All is darkness, the air filled with chill fog and mist; the travellers wander about fearfully, the only sounds at first the barking of dogs. There follows an episode evidently taken directly from the *Faerie Queene* where Sir Scudamour visits the cottage of the blacksmith Care.[7] In all this valley there are no dwellings save great forges where giants work unceasingly at the anvils. There is no rest, for when the night bird of sleep swoops

[7] Cf. *Faerie Queene,* 4, 5, 33 ff.

down to the weary, it is driven away by the clanging of the great hammers. Thus there begins a long season of penance for the sinful man.

After many days, the light begins to appear, and the fog and mist to disperse. Above the hill, the weary man can see the first light of the sun, but something else must happen before the valley can behold the pure light, for on that hill, its shadow obscuring the sun, stands a great castle, the stronghold of Daemon. Here the author combines two of the most popular themes in medieval allegory: the siege of the castle, and the war between the Vices and Virtues, both of which had their first form in Prudentius, the one in *Hamartigenia,* the other in *Psychomachia.* This particular castle has been called Pantheothen, but the wanderer understands at last that it should have been Pandaemoniothen. In it is the rabble rout of the Vices — many of them bearing the names of medieval Vices, but some of the others reminding the reader that the poem is a product of seventeenth-century England, as do also the names of the walls which surround the castle: Inevitable-Destiny-of-God's-Decree and Invincible-Fleshlie-Infirmitie. Both of these, the poet reminds his readers, are invincible only because man has thought them so. Here, moreover, are all those pagan torments of Hades, which the medievalists delighted in introducing: a vulture tears the heart of Tityus, Sisyphus eternally rolls his stone up the never-ending hill; Tantalus forever yearns to stoop to the water which always recedes from him. All are under the spell of the mighty power that rules within the walls. As the sun rises higher and higher, Mnemon hears in the distance the clattering of an armed troop and beholds the mighty band on warlike steeds, which bear on their trappings the words: True righteousnesse unto the Lord of Might. This is the host of the godlike Michael. After a decisive struggle between the powers of good and evil, the castle falls before the godlike warriors, and the light of the sun streams over the valley.

But the pilgrimage is not over yet for the wanderer. Accompanied by Simon and his strange parents, Mnemon goes on through flowery fields until he comes to a hill, the ascent of which he insists upon beginning. Here he meets three sisters, Justice, Philosophy, and Apathy, with whom he wishes to linger, thinking that now at last he has reached truth. But he finds, contrary to custom, that

it is not on the hill that truth dwells, and he is forced to descend to a dark valley—the valley of the vapors which arise as long as man chooses to remain in the land of beasts. In passing through the fumes which are of self, he loses himself, for this is the valley of Nothingness. There too, the aged parents, Patience and Self-Denial—which are of self—give up their lives to their son, who becomes thereby the complete soul; vitality being lost, reality and spirit remain. Casting off the last vapors of self, Mnemon finds in the newly understood Simon his own soul; he pushes through the last of the black vapors and comes out upon that country of God where

> there's no fear of Death's dart-holding hand;
> Fast love, fix'd life, firm peace in Theoprepia land.

With that comes the end of the seventeenth-century pilgrimage of the soul, and Mnemon, now an old man, sinks back upon his seat beneath the trees, lost in memory of youth.

MARJORIE H. NICOLSON.

University of Minnesota.

A STUDY IN MASEFIELD'S VOCABULARY

The most casual reader of the poems of John Masefield must notice the number of uncommon words that the poet uses. It was in an endeavor to classify such words that the present investigation was undertaken.

The poems read for the purpose of this study were those in *Collected Poems* (The Macmillan Co., 1919) and *Reynard the Fox* (The Macmillan Co., 1919).[1] The *NED.* is the chief authority consulted to furnish meanings. Of an original list of 261 words, 42 have not been found. The 219 remaining words were separated into the following classes: obsolete, archaic, rare, unusual nautical words, words connected with hunting, slang and colloquial, dialectal, and words unusual in themselves or used in special senses.

Thirty-three words were found to be obsolete. Some of these are only old forms or spellings of modern words: "agen" for

[1] *CP* = *Collected Poems; RF* = *Reynard the Fox.* Numbers refer to pages.

"again" (*CP.* 106), "brued" for "imbrued" (*CP.* 503). Others illustrate old senses of words now in good use: "cocking" (*CP.* 330), from "cock," 'to swagger, strut'; "err" (*RF.* 53), 'to ramble, roam, stray, wander.' Still others are words now entirely obsolete: "ere" (*CP.* 210), a variant of "ear," an obsolete verb meaning 'to plough'; "salue" (*CP.* 164), an old greeting, the same as our "salute"; "treacher" (*CP.* 163), 'a deceiver, a cheat; one who deceives by trickery.'

Only five archaisms appear: "drave" (*RF.* 108), "lecher" (*CP.* 163), "shrieve" (*CP.* 98), "stricken" (*CP.* 400), and "thorpes" (*CP.* 427).

Three words classified as rare may be mentioned by themselves: "kerns" (*CP.* 472), plural of "kern"; "tally" (*CP.* 4), a nautical verb, now rare; and "tally" (*CP.* 251), a noun.

As might be expected, nautical terms abound, especially in *Dauber* and the *Salt-Water Ballads.* This investigation embraces only the more unusual words, of which fifteen have been carefully examined. Among these may be mentioned: "fothered" (*CP.* 455), to stop a leak by means of a sail covered with loose material (Masefield seems to have extended the meaning by applying it to stoppage caused by mud); "pantiles" (*CP.* 306), 'humorously applied to hard sea-biscuit'; and "rip-rap" (*CP.* 454), the tide against the wind.

Five hunting terms illustrate the poet's acquaintance with the vocabulary of that sport: "cast" (*RF.* 138), 'Of dogs (or huntsmen): To spread out and search in different directions for a lost scent'; "feathered" (*RF.* 139), 'Of a hound: To make a quivering movement with the tail and body'; "lurchers" (*RF.* 109), plural of "lurcher," 'A cross-bred dog'; "mort" (*CP.* 290), 'the note sounded on a horn at the death of a deer' (used figuratively by Masefield — 'The mort for gods cast out and overthrown'); and "plough" (*RF.* 96), for ploughed land, chiefly hunting slang.

Slang and colloquialisms are not infrequent, especially in the longer narrative poems. The slang seems to be drawn from no particular class or locality and to be concerned with no particular activity. Examples are: "quod" (*CP.* 140), meaning prison; "put" (*CP.* 122), 'a blockhead'; "nip" (*RF.* 119), 'to move rapidly or nimbly'; "doss" (*CP.* 42), 'sleep'; "deady" (*CP.*

137), a name for gin, "so called apparently from the name of the distiller. The London Directory for 1812 has D. Deady, Distiller and Brandy Merchant"; "beak" (*CP.* 236), 'a magistrate or justice of the peace.' The following are colloquialisms: "cockshies" (*CP.* 185), from "cockshy," "a free throw or 'shy' at an object set up for the purpose"; "dollop" (*CP.* 8), 'a clumsy or shapeless lump of anything'; "lollopin'" (*CP.* 7), an onomatopœic extension of "loll" meaning to bob up and down; "tot" (*CP.* 149), a minute quantity of anything; and two contractions, "turps" (*CP.* 263) and "vet" (*RF.* 56), short for "turpentine" and "veterinary" respectively.

The largest division is that which contains words of various dialects. They are drawn from no one locality. There is space here for only a few examples: "dunched" (*RF.* 101), from "dunch," 'to strike or push with a short rapid blow'; "hales" (*CP.* 172), 'the handles of a plough'; "meuses" (*RF.* 80), from "meuse," 'an opening or gap in a fence or hedge'; "mort" (*CP.* 84), 'a great quantity or number'; "poshay" (*RF.* 32), a corruption of "post-chaise"; "rist" (*CP.* 242), 'a rising ground or slope.'

In a division of words of miscellaneous character have been placed those which seem to be very uncommon and those which Masefield has used in a transferred sense. Of fourteen of the former class the following may be mentioned: "bent" (*CP.* 231), 'a place covered with grass'; "clicketting" ("clicketting time," *RF.* 81), 'Of the fox: to be in heat, to copulate'; "fairings" (*CP.* 186), from "fairing," 'a present given at or brought from a fair'; "poach" (*RF.* 9), 'to trample into muddy holes; to cut up with hoofs.' In the following words, chosen from a list of fifteen, Masefield seems to have altered the spelling or transferred the meaning to suit his own purposes: "bet" ("'Hurrah! Cape Horn is bet!'" *CP.* 306), a past participle of "beat," used from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries; "con" ("'One's so safe with such a son to con her'" *CP.* 192), 'to give sailing directions to a steersman,' used by Masefield to refer to piloting or steering a woman through a crowd; "flowth" (*CP.* 432), evidently a contraction for "floweth"; "rollen" (*CP.* 134), a vulgar pronunciation of "rolling."

There remains a list of forty-two words which have not been

found in any dictionary. Twenty-two of these are verbs, sixteen nouns, and four adjectives.

Verbs.

He *barged* the fence as the bank gave way (*RF.* 156).
. . . *a-bluin'* o' my advance (*CP.* 12).
. . . the men have been
Boxing about since midnight (*CP.* 453).
. . . the meet
Came *clopping* up the grass in spate (*RF.* 65).
His six hens *cluckered* (RF. 119).
Kyrle took his *cobb'd* stick (*CP.* 489).
And no convenient thumb to *crock* for you (*CP.* 129).
. . . So *fash* . . . (*CP.* 306).
. . . his keen nose *flaired* (*RF.* 86).
His six hens cluckered and *flucked* to perch (*RF.* 119).
. . . *Gerr* on, now, Dane (*RF.* 155).
Sometimes he missed his ratline and was *grassed* (*CP.* 292).
I shall hear them *hilly-hollying* . . . (*CP.* 18).
. . . flew down and *kukked* (*RF.* 83).
Stray pheasants *kukkered* out of copse (*RF.* 70).
And drunk and *leched* from day till morrow (*CP.* 163).
From *primming* sparrowbills day by day (*RF.* 119).
. . . they *scored* to cry (*RF.* 122).
A wet twig *scraked* . . . (*CP.* 388).
My mind began to carp and *tetter* (*CP.* 139).
It *torts* the tiger's loin . . . (*CP.* 146).
. . . Put in, man, *zook* the plough (*CP.* 174).

Nouns.

And *bumboat* pan, my sons . . . (*CP.* 308).
The *chantyman* bent at the halliards putting a tune to the shout (*CP.* 3
The *clop* of the hooves on the road was plain (*RF.* 147).
Goneys and *gullies* an' all o' the birds o' the sea (*CP.* 16).
Dim with green bubbles and twisted water *meets* (*CP.* 252).
Where the bent grass beats upon the unploughed *poorland* (*CP.* 486).
The gate was backed against the *ryme* (*CP.* 171).
Great chested, muscled in the *slats* (*RF.* 54).
My God, he's got the *spudder* . . . (*CP.* 233).
Made him put on steam till he went a *stinger* (*RF.* 114).
For hot blood *suckage* . . . (*RF.* 136).
. . . and talked
To Jim, of *through-pin* in his master's jade (*CP.* 389).
Us had so many I've alost the *tip* (*CP.* 380).
Had put the *violet* in his blood (*RF.* 81).
Arose from his *wallet* . . . (*RF.* 109).

Adjectives.

Dog, drive them *dangy* red ones . . . (*CP.* 392).
Like *hoovey* sheep . . . (*CP.* 215).
You're young, you *thinks*, 'n' you're *lairy* (*CP.* 27).
Look at her! *lummy*, like a Christmas tree (*CP.* 280).

The meanings of some of these words are fairly evident. "Cluckered," "clopping," "fluckered," "gerr," "kukked," "kukkered," "scraked," and "clop" are probably onomatopoeic. "Fash" is perhaps a contraction for "fashion." "Torts" evidently means "twists." "Chantyman" is not an uncommon word; its omission from the dictionary is surprising. "Slats" surely refers to the ribs of a hound. "Hoovey" is coined from "hoove," a disease of cattle. "Lairy" doubtless means "cautious." The others, however, are more difficult of explanation.

The investigation leads to no single result. The fact that Masefield is familiar with the nooks and crannies of the language needs no further witness. It is undeniable also that a wide vocabulary is necessary to understand the poems thoroughly. The largest class of words is dialectal, a fact which makes reading particularly difficult for an American. What has induced the poet to sprinkle his poems so profusely with unfamiliar terms? We should expect to find dialect in *Salt-Water Ballads, The Everlasting Mercy, The Widow in the Bye Street, The Daffodil Fields, Dauber,* and *Reynard the Fox.* In other poems also we must judge the diction by the effect it produces. Is it not true that in *August, 1914* some part of the effect, the atmosphere, is wrought by the simplicity of the diction, by the preponderance of homely, Anglo-Saxon words, such as "wold" ("The forlorn pinewoods droop above the wold"), "fallow" ("The fallow on the hill not yet brought in"), and "brae" ("And silence broods like spirit on the brae")? Again, in *The Everlasting Mercy,* a poem full of Anglo-Saxon terms, we find at the end a profusion of simple, native words, most of them relating to ploughing and each serving in some degree to produce that intimate sense of the early morning, with Farmer Callow symbolizing to Saul Kane the "spiritual ploughman."

> Old Callow, stooped above the hales,
> Ploughing the stubble into wales.
>
> And girt red flamës twink and twire
> As though he ploughed the hill afire.

This seems to have been the purpose in Masefield's mind, a purpose that has been for the most part successfully achieved, for the average reader is not seriously annoyed by his own ignorance. Any slight annoyance is superseded by the pleasure that comes from a recognition of a skillful choice of words for their connotative values. The extent to which a poet can adapt his vocabulary to the attainment of such an end is one measure of his greatness.

ANTON A. RAVEN.

Dartmouth College.

KING LEAR AND *PELLEAS AND ETTARRE*

Professor A. C. Bradley, in a well-known passage, has called attention to Shakspere's continual reference to the lower animals in *King Lear*. Not only are the various lower animals constantly referred to throughout the play, but—what is more important—they are also frequently mentioned in direct comparison with mankind. Goneril, Regan, Oswald, and others are compared to rats, serpents, wolves, foxes, tigers, dogs, and the like with such frequency as to suggest that Shakspere wished to stress the intimate relation between man and the lower animals and perhaps to suggest that man is, after all, but a higher beast. Indeed, the suggestion is actually made by more than one character in the play.[1] Such a conception is likewise in complete accord with the "elemental" atmosphere of *King Lear*, especially as this appears in the storm scenes.[2]

A noticeable parallel to this relation between man and the lower world can be found in Tennyson's *Pelleas and Ettarre*. Pelleas, becoming impatient for news from Gawain, who had promised to win for him the love of his lady, Ettarre, pushes his way through

[1] Cf. *Gloucester*. I' the last night's storm I such a fellow saw,
Which made me think a man a worm. (IV, i, 32-3.)
For other examples see II, iii, 6-9; iv, 205-7, 264; III, vii, 99-101; IV, ii, 49; v, iii, 307.

[2] "As those incessant references to wolf and tiger made us see humanity 'reeling back into the beast' and ravening against itself, so in the storm we seem to see Nature herself convulsed by the same horrible passions." Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 270. See also pages 266-70.

the moonlit garden until he finds Gawain and Ettarre sleeping side by side in the third pavilion.

> Back as a hand that pushes thro' the leaf
> To find a nest and feels a snake, he drew;
> Back as a coward slinks from what he fears
> To cope with, or a traitor proven, or hound
> Beaten, did Pelleas in an utter shame
> Creep.

Overcoming his desire to slay them both, he lays the naked sword of the tourney athwart their naked throats.

> And forth he past, and mounting on his horse
> Stared at her towers that, larger than themselves
> In their own darkness, throng'd into the moon;
> Then crushed the saddle with his thighs, and clench'd
> His hands, and madden'd with himself and moan'd:
> Would they have risen against me in their blood
> At the last day? I might have answered them
> Even before high God. O towers so strong,
> Huge, solid, would that even while I gaze
> The crack of earthquake shivering to your base
> Split you, and Hell burst up your harlot roofs
> Bellowing, and charr'd you thro' and thro' within,
> Black as the harlot's heart—hollow as a skull!
> Let the fierce east scream thro' your eyelet-holes,
> And whirl the dust of harlots round and round
> In dung and nettles! hiss, snake,—I saw him there—
> Let the fox bark, let the wolf yell. Who yells
> Here in the still, sweet summer night, but I—
> I, the poor Pelleas whom she call'd her fool?
> Fool, beast—he, she, or I? myself most fool;
> Beast too, as lacking human wit—disgraced,
> Dishonour'd all for trial of true love—
> Love?—we be all alike: only the King
> Hath made us fools and liars. O noble vows!
> O great and sane and simple race of brutes
> That own no lust because they have no law!
> For why should I have loved her to my shame?
> I loathe her, as I loved her to my shame.
> I never loved her, I but lusted for her—
> Away—[3]

[3] Neither references to the lower animals nor comparisons of men to them are limited to the passages just quoted; see, for example, Pelleas's reference to Arthur's hall at Camelot,

> Black nest of rats, he groan'd, ye build too high.

See also lines 177, 186, 189, 255, 276, 283, 595.

Even the casual reader is struck by the elemental nature of the quotations, by the references to the lower animals, and especially by the poet's use of such strong words as *hell, harlot, dung, skull, fool, lust, liars,* and *brutes.* In the few lines quoted, mankind is compared to snakes, hounds, foxes, rats, and wolves in particular, and to beasts and brutes in general.[4]

Nor is it more difficult to show that Tennyson has in mind here, as elsewhere in his poetry, the essential unity of man and beast, the elemental, universal nature of the animal world. In the passage that has been quoted, Pelleas definitely links himself with beasts.

This identity of man and beast in the idyll is also suggested by the references to the animal passions of man as contained in such words as *harlot* and *lust.* In Tennyson's view, nothing so tended to lower mankind to the level of the beast as impure passion; nearly every man or woman of impure life in the *Idylls* is compared by either metaphor or simile, usually both, to one or more of the lower animals. In this stress upon the harlot-idea, Tennyson again parallels the tone of *King Lear.* Almost as noticeable as the frequent mention of the lower animals in the play is the reference to the subject of illicit love and the use of such words as *lust, bastard, courtesan, wantons,* and *bawd.*[5]

The deeper, elemental atmosphere in *Pelleas and Ettarre* is supplied by the references to the judgment day, hell, the darkness, the moon, and the earthquake, and perhaps by Pelleas's assumption of identity with such "unearthly" elements as wrath, shame, hate, evil fame, and the wind:

> I am wrath and shame and hate and evil fame,
> And like a poisonous wind I pass to blast
> And blaze the crime of Lancelot and the Queen.

It will be noticed that the poem thus reproduces in each of the four particulars—the repeated mention of the lower animals, the comparison between man and animals, the identity of man with beasts, and the elemental atmosphere—the characteristics of the

[4] An examination of the fourth Book of Malory's *Le Morte Darthur* shows that the references to the lower animals originated with Tennyson.

[5] I forebear to give the entire list; those which I have given are among the milder terms. See I, i, 7 ff.; ii, 1 ff.; 121-5; v, 47-8; IV, ii, 19 ff.; vi, 110 ff., 158-161, 261 ff.; v, i, 19, 55-65; iii, 71 ff., 171-4.

play which were described at the beginning of the article. Furthermore, in its stress upon illicit love, the poem again repeats a marked characteristic of the play. Whether or not Tennyson was consciously working under the influence of *King Lear* when he wrote *Pelleas and Ettarre* and was thus endeavoring to reproduce in his poem the "elemental" effect which Shakspere achieved, is impossible to determine. There are, however, certain supporting facts which, taken in connection with the resemblances already noted between the play and the poem, would seem to indicate that Tennyson's poem was written under a definite (though perhaps unconscious) influence from the play.[6]

In the first place, it is noteworthy that the poem and the play parallel each other so closely. Professor Bradley, trying to prove that *Timon of Athens* was written immediately after *King Lear,* bases his argument on the essential similarity of the two plays.[7] The poem of *Pelleas and Ettarre* is so closely parallel to *King Lear* that it could be substituted for *Timon* in the comparison which Professor Bradley draws, without altering the truth of the passage. Thus, both the play and the poem deal with the tragic effects of ingratitude. In both the victim is exceptionally unsuspicious, softhearted, and vehement. In both he is completely overwhelmed, passing through fury to madness in each case. Famous passages in the play and in the poem are curses; and in each occur repeated comparisons between man and the beasts.

There is a further point of similarity between the play and the poem in that the atmosphere of each is almost unique in its author's works. There are no stronger scenes in Shakspere than the storm scenes in *Lear;* and there are no stronger scenes in the *Idylls* than the curse of Pelleas. There may be some which touch us more deeply, the death of Balin and Balan, for example; or scenes which are more intensely dramatic, such as the death of Tristram; but there is no single scene in which the language is so strong, so unrestrained and fierce. Brewed of such ingredients as *hell, harlot, earthquake, dung, skull, snake, wolf, fool, beast, liar,* and *lust,* it could not be otherwise. I doubt whether there is in the whole

[6] For a suggestion as to the wording of this sentence, as well as for other helpful suggestions, I am indebted to Professor Carleton Brown of Bryn Mawr College.

[7] Bradley, *Shakesperean Tragedy,* p. 246.

of Tennyson a passage in which the vocabulary is more raw or more ugly.

That Tennyson was familiar with *King Lear* needs no proof. It is, however, interesting to notice that in his remarks upon Shakspere in the *Memoir, King Lear* is the only play that is mentioned more than once; this fact and the nature of his remarks about the play would show that he was at least well acquainted with it.

He would say, "There are three repartees in Shakespeare which always bring tears to my eyes from their simplicity. One is in *King Lear* when Lear says to Cordelia, 'So young and so untender,' and Cordelia lovingly answers, 'So young, my lord, and true.'"

"*King Lear* cannot possibly be acted, it is too titanic. At the beginning of the play Lear, in his old age, has grown half mad, choleric and despotic, and therefore cannot brook Cordelia's silence. This play shows a state of society where men's passions are savage and uncurbed. No play like this anywhere—not even the *Agamemnon*—is so terrifically human." [8]

The last quotation shows that, whether he consciously reproduced it in *Pelleas and Ettarre* or not, Tennyson was at least aware of the elemental atmosphere of *King Lear* and of its portrayal of the beast in man.

Alfred Allan Kern.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

AN OLD AMERICAN COLLEGE PLAY

One of the rarest of early American plays is *The Mercenary Match,* written by Barnabas Bidwell.[1] Indeed Seilhamer, in his *History of the American Theatre,* 1889, referred to it as a lost drama; but now three copies are known to be in existence—one at Harvard, one in the Connecticut Historical Society Library at Hartford, and one in the Library of Congress. Because of its

[8] *Memoir,* II, pages 290, 292.

[1] "The Mercenary Match, A Tragedy. By Barna. Bidwell. New-Haven: Printed by Meigs, Bowen & Dana, in Chapel-Street." The date, which does not appear on the title-page, is given as 1784 by Evans, and as 1785 by Wegelin.

rarity we have been compelled to rely for information mainly on Dunlap's curt statement: "And we have read the very pleasant and laugh-provoking tragedy of 'The Mercenary Match,' written by Barnaby Bidwell, Esq. This tragedy was, perhaps still is, in blank verse. The shouts of laughter produced by the reading of it in a company of young men some forty years ago, are vividly recollected." [2]

In view of the present-day interest in the early drama of this country, and in view, also, of the adjective acrimonious, sometimes applied to Dunlap, a more thorough analysis of this work may be justifiably offered.

First, who was Barnabas Bidwell? Son of the Reverend Adonijah Bidwell (Yale 1740), he was born at Tyringham (now Monterey), Massachusetts, in 1763. He graduated from Yale in 1785. In the fall of 1787 he was appointed tutor in Yale College, in which capacity he served for three years, gaining during his incumbency a considerable reputation as an elegant writer. Thereafter he entered the practice of law in Massachusetts. He soon became prominent in his profession and was elected to various important offices, including that of Congressional Representative and of Attorney General of the State. In 1810 Bidwell's accounts as County Treasurer—a position he had held for some twenty years—were examined, and he was found to have embezzled over $10,000. This disclosure was especially inopportune, for at this very time President Madison was considering his elevation to the Supreme Court of the United States. Just before the trial for his offense Bidwell absconded to Canada, where he resided until his death in 1833. In his day he enjoyed a reputation as an orator of note, a profound jurist and a man of wide culture and courtly manners.[3]

The Mercenary Match was among Bidwell's youthful literary efforts; it was written and published during his Senior year, and had one stage appearance when it was acted by the author's college-

[2] William Dunlap, *A History of the American Theatre*, New York, 1832, p. 71. In addition to this reference there is a three-sentence synopsis of the play in P. L. Ford's *Some Notes towards an Essay on The Beginnings of American Dramatic Literature, 1606-1789*, New York, 1893.

[3] F. B. Dexter, *Biographical Sketches of the Graduates of Yale College with Annals of the College History*, Vol. IV, New York, 1907, pp. 387 ff.

mates.[4] Whether it evoked laughter on this occasion seems to be unrecorded; whether it deserved laughter we shall shortly see.

The scarcity of the printed play will perhaps warrant the inclusion here of a fairly full sketch of the plot. The scene is laid in Boston; the time is apparently "the present."

Act I. The heroine has been forced by her father, in the face of her protests, into marriage with a Mr. Jenson because of his wealth. She admits to her maid that he is an excellent man, but she does not love him; hence her life is a tragedy. Mr. Jenson, entering, informs her that he is about to be sent on a two-year diplomatic mission to France, and offers his wife the option of going or remaining. She decides to consult her former lover, Major Shapely.

Act II. Shapely is seen to be a selfish schemer, who is resolved to gain Mrs. Jenson for himself. His dupe and catspaw is Lyndall, a wealthy, aspiring simpleton, who covets Jenson's diplomatic appointment. The major advises Lyndall to place a spy in Jenson's house in order to discover some secret that may be used for his undoing, and consents to act in that capacity himself. At Mrs. Jenson's request Shapely goes to her house to offer his advice, and while he is there Jenson, on Lyndall's recommendation, agrees to take him into his household as steward.

Act III. Informed by Jenson that his wife is an unmanageable shrew, Shapely suggests crossing her in order to tame her proud spirit. Specifically he proposes that she be deprived of certain jewels. The remainder of the act is devoted to the Major's seductive practices against Lyndall's purse.

Act IV. Mrs. Jenson complains to Shapely of her husband's harsh treatment. He hints that her jewels are being given to another woman. In a soliloquy she utters the wish that she might be Shapely's bride, and swears to avenge herself with the death

[4] Dunlap, p. 71; Dexter, p. 389. The circumstances under which the play was presented do not yield to investigation. Bidwell was a member of Brothers in Unity, one of the old Yale debating societies, and the performance may have been given by this organization. The minutes show that a "dialogue" called *The Modern Mistake*, written by Bidwell, was given by the Society April 3, 1784, but there is no mention of *The Mercenary Match*. That the two titles do not refer to the same play is clearly indicated by a comparison of the *dramatis personae* of the printed play with the cast of the "dialogue" as entered in the minutes.

of her mate in case he is proved guilty of infidelity. Jenson enters and demands his miniature, saying "somebody may esteem it more." Thus convinced of his faithlessness, she vows his death.

Act V. All plans having been made, Shapely, accompanied by two seamen, enters Jenson's chamber and stabs him. The maid soon comes upon the corpse and shrieks out the discovery. Neighbors and officers rush in and seize the murderer. Mrs. Jenson dies of the shock. Shapely, thwarted in an attempt to commit suicide, assures the seamen that their death is imminent from a poisoned drink he administered just before the deed to prevent their telling tales. The play ends with the villain's pronouncement of his own damnation to "everlasting woe."

That the plot contains

> faults of almost every name,
> That candour can forgive, or censure blame

is admitted in the epilogue with engaging frankness and a considerable degree of truth. The parts of the tale are badly articulated, the catastrophe coming more or less independently of what precedes. A greater defect is the lack of motivation; decisions are reached and deeds done for reasons that could not possibly prompt them in anything but a badly constructed play. The author loses all the dramatic interest and probability that may reside in his intrigue by failing to create in his heroine an ardent passion for her accomplice. Moreover the characterization is negligible, all the *dramatis personae* being the merest conventions, with one exception: Lyndall, the ambitious coward, shows traces of skill in portraiture. Under the magic of Shapely's large promises he grows confident and boastful, but in solitude his assurance rapidly oozes away until he again becomes the spineless poltroon.

Further, as might be expected in a play by a college boy, *The Mercenary Match* leans heavily on those dramas with which a student would most likely be acquainted—Shakespeare's in particular. The phraseology is frequently suggestive of Shakespeare, and the trick of ending each act with couplets was no doubt caught from him. In situation, too, the indebtedness is clear. *The Taming of the Shrew* must have furnished the idea of crossing Mrs. Jenson in Act III. The murder and the means of its discovery are in the *Macbeth* manner. The spirit in which Jenson

meets death, and Mr. Worthy's eulogy over his body derive from *Julius Cæsar*.

As for the basic situation, the assassination of a man by his wife and her lover, it was probably suggested to Bidwell by the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus. In the structure of the drama, also, a Greek influence is noticeable. The unities of place and action, and probably the unity of time, are observed. The murder occurs off-stage and is later narrated by one of the participants, who thus performs the office of the Greek messenger.

Still another possible plot source is the domestic tragedy *Arden of Feversham* as adapted by George Lillo from the anonymous Elizabethan version and produced in 1759. Here again, as in the American play, occur the murder plot of wife and lover, the "Et tu, Brute," and other more or less parallel *motifs*.

But in spite of grave shortcomings, which are not surprising in the work of a novice of twenty-one, and which, withal, are not more flagrant than those of the average American play of its period, *The Mercenary Match* is not wholly insignificant as a piece of pioneer dramatic literature. There is one scene which has a certain mild impressiveness: While the assassins are in the fatal chamber, Mrs. Jenson, waiting without, suffers the agony of terrified suspense, and half relents in her evil design; but Shapely soon reappears with the bloody dagger. His narrative of the deed is not without dignity and effectiveness as he remorsefully exclaims:

> He look'd so tenderly at me,
> His anguish fixt a dagger in my soul.

Stylistically the drama, like other early American school plays, is rhetorical and declamatory. One purpose of all such compositions was to display the oratorical skill of the participants; hence long, artificial speeches are certain to appear. But at least Bidwell's blank verse is smooth and easy, and if he is capable of such unpoetic lines as

> But, as the social partner of my life,
> I can't approve of him.

or

> Which dost thou choose, to honour *Gallia's* court;
> Or let *Bostonians* share thy company?

he is also capable of rising distinctly above this humble level. To the truth of this statement let the following quotations testify:

Mrs. J. Relentless sire,
What had I done, to forfeit thy regard?
How couldst thou trifle with thy daughter's life,
And bid me wed despair? (Act I.)

J. *Now* breathing spring, with milder gales succeeds,—
Dissolves the hoary frost,—spreads o'er the fields
A curious carpet (wrought in nature's loom)
Of chearing green, diversify'd with flowers;
And bids the year unfold her stores to man.
Now night, which wraps one half the earth in gloom,
Has roll'd her shadows over to the west.
Alternate day pursuing night around,
Comes laughing from the east, array'd in light,
Invites the flocks to play, the birds to sing,
And drowsy mortals to arise from sleep.
Now pleasure greets the soul through every sense.
Enjoy my fair the beauties of the *spring*,
And all the fragrance of the lovely *morn*. (Act I.)

Mrs. J. I take my mournful leave of thee, O world;
Thy beauty's faded; thy delights are cold!
Farewell, farewell, thou empty, flattering world!
Begone, with all thy fair, inviting scenes!
Farewell, contented thoughts, and quiet rest!
And did not fear forbid the tragic deed,
I'd bid a long, a last adieu to life. (Act IV.)

Shap. The period soon will come, to bless our eyes,
Fly, lingering moments, swiftly urge your flight,
To bear away the intervening time;
Then drop your wings, descend, and walk with us.
What scenes of dalliance open to our view!
Love makes a paradise on earth.

(*he sings*)

Mrs. J. A pretty song! You have a lovely voice;
A charming voice you have; It pleases me.
Shap. And me no less, because it pleases you.
Mrs. J. How sweet is music to the mourning soul!
Shap. As sweet as honey and as pure as light.
When through the portals of the listening ear,
Soft music enters and salutes the soul,
It soon dispels the frowning cloud of care,
Bids faded melancholy yield a smile,
And sorrow wipe away the starting tear.
Mrs. J. I love to hear your voice.
Have you no other song? (Act V.)

Mrs. J. Yet nature sinks—Death pulls me down a main—
Oh! Oh! I leap the eternal precipice. (Act v.)

The play is empty, it is inflated, its sentiments are hackneyed; yet there is revealed in it a feeling for felicitous poetic phrase and in general for literary effect hardly to be met with elsewhere in American drama of the eighteenth century. Its only rival in this direction is Dunlap's *Leicester* (written 1790), which parallels it somewhat closely in broad outline and occasionally in diction. This fact may explain the later writer's contempt for Bidwell, though the similarity between the two pieces probably arises merely from identity of models.

As a final observation it may be pointed out that *The Mercenary Match* belongs to the category of the bourgeois tragedy of domestic life, a type which flourished in Europe in the eighteenth century, Lillo being the chief representative in England, Lessing in Germany, and Diderot in France. In this country Bidwell's play was the first specimen of the genre to appear. The author was perhaps conscious of this affinity when he wrote in the prologue:

The characters which he unfolds to view
Are not sublime although he thinks them true.

But shows the miseries of a man and wife,
A simple circumstance of modern life.

The Mercenary Match, then, has at least two claims to the serious consideration of the student of American drama. In the first place it is one of the extremely few eighteenth century plays with any claim, however slight, to poetic merit; and secondly it is our first example of an important dramatic form that had already gained wide currency in Europe.

Oral Sumner Coad.

Columbia University.

A NOTE ON *JULIUS CÆSAR*

> And I am Brutus, Marcus Brutus, I,
> Brutus my country's friend: Know me for Brutus. (v, iv, 7-8.)

From the earliest text of this play to the latest there has been uncertainty about the speaker of these lines. It is not an unimportant matter, as it will be seen that to assign them to the proper speaker throws considerable light on some of the characters and on the movement of the plot. And I think that a careful study of the text and of the sources need leave no reasonable doubt.

In the First Folio these lines follow immediately the stage directions, "Enter Soldiers and fight," and are not assigned to any speaker. The previous speaker was Cato, but the content of the lines and the intervening stage directions make it clear that they are not intended to be a continuation of Cato's speech. The next speaker is Lucilius, and the question is, are these two lines the words of Lucilius, or are they, as they seem, the words of Brutus?

From the time of Rowe, by common consent of editors, the lines have been ascribed to Brutus, though for no other reason than that the speaker says, "And I am Brutus." So far as I know, Professor Michael Macmillan in his edition of the play (1902) in the Arden Shakespeare was the first to assign them to Lucilius. In his note he says in part: "The iteration of the name of Brutus sounds like the language of a man who was pretending to be what he was not." He therefore gives them to Lucilius, the next speaker, and adds: "It seems probable that the printers of the Folio by mistake put the heading "*Luc.*" two lines too low down."

In a letter to *The Times* (London), July 18th, 1913, Mr. Cobden-Sanderson announced a new edition of the play, and again took up the matter, adducing further reasons for ascribing the lines to Lucilius. He made a careful study of the context, and showed from the development of the play that Lucilius was the only one who could consistently speak these words.

American editors generally, however, have not been convinced and have been persistent in giving the lines still to Brutus. A few only have in their notes conceded that Lucilius may probably be the speaker, though no one that I know of goes fully into the matter. Furness in the Variorum *Julius Cæsar* (1913) apparently

accepts Macmillan's view that the lines belong to Lucilius, for he quotes his note in full, and no other, though he gives no comment of his own. Another editor, B[rooke] in *Shakespeare's Principal Plays* (1914), even tries to justify giving the lines to Brutus. He says that "Some critics have proposed giving lines 7 and 8 to Lucilius, who is impersonating Brutus, but such an arrangement would leave the exit of Brutus unexplained." This, however, need occasion no difficulty when it is clear that Brutus does not again appear in the scene. His "Exit" should come immediately after his first and only speech. And even the latest editor, Mason, in the Yale Shakespeare (*Julius Cæsar,* 1919), still persists in giving the lines to Brutus. It is quite necessary, then, to go into the question rather fully.

The scene in which these lines occur follows closely on the preceding scene, and gives an account of the second day's battle. In the preceding scene Cassius and Titinius both meet death, and Brutus is at once very conscious of his great loss, and the loss to his cause. He then makes a frantic effort to compensate the loss, and attempts to stir up the valor of his younger followers, and passionately cries out: "Are yet two Romans living such as these?" In an inspiring speech he calls upon Lucilius, young Cato, and others to take the places of Cassius and Titinius. Lucilius and Cato at once take up the challenge, and attempt to redeem the day. The development of the scene then becomes perfectly clear if we give the disputed lines to Lucilius, but if they are given to Brutus no adequate explanation seems possible.

It needs to be remembered that the Folio shows no division of scenes at this place. Following directly, then, upon the preceding scene, Brutus feels greatly encouraged by the quick response of the two younger Romans, and, in the opening words of Scene iv, exclaims: "Yet Country-men: O yet, hold up your heads." Then Cato rushes into the battle calling out, "I am the son of Marcus Cato;" and Lucilius, if we give these lines to him, follows declaring, "And I am Brutus, Marcus Brutus, I." He, too, rushes into battle, but calling himself Brutus, with the evident intent of distracting the soldiers from the real Brutus, who meanwhile makes his escape. That the ruse is successful is presently seen when the soldiers, on capturing Lucilius, think they have taken Brutus. Their mistake is found out only when Antony comes up and assures them "This is not Brutus."

This study of the text itself is surely sufficient to justify all editors in giving the lines to Lucilius. But there is still another ground for so doing that has been generally overlooked. It is, of course, not safe to interpret Shakespeare from his 'sources,' but in this case the sources go to confirm the conviction reached from a study of the text. If these lines do not belong to Lucilius, then at this point the dramatist departed materially from Plutarch, with no evident purpose, but with only confusion as the result.

After telling the story of Cato, faithfully reproduced in the drama, Plutarch says that many of Brutus's friends rushed into danger to save Brutus's life, "amongst whom there was one of Brutus' friends called Lucilius, who seeing a troupe of barbarous men making no reckoning of all men else they met in their way, but going all together right against Brutus, he determined to stay them with the hazard of his life; and being left behind, told them that he was Brutus: and because they should believe him, he prayed them to bring him to Antonius. . . ." When brought into the presence of Antony, Lucilius told him: "And now for myself, I am come unto thee, having deceived these men of arms here, bearing them down that I was Brutus" (Skeat's edition of *Shakespeare's Plutarch,* pp. 148-9).

Plutarch further adds, what is important for an interpretation of the character of Brutus, that Lucilius said when brought before Antony: "Antonius, I dare assure thee that no enemy hath taken nor shall take Marcus Brutus alive, and I beseech God keep him from that fortune: for wheresoever he be found alive or dead, he will be found like himself" (*Ibid.,* p. 149). This, too, Shakespeare turns directly into his verse in lines that follow in the same scene (ll. 20-25). In every important detail the dramatist has closely followed the biographer, and had apparently adopted fully Plutarch's conception of Brutus, and strives only to reproduce it faithfully, not departing materially from either the details or the sequence of the narrative.

The Brutus of Plutarch and of the play was quite willing to escape death by deceiving his enemies, and was moreover ready to have his friends sacrifice themselves to save his life. He may have been ready to use his dagger on himself for the good of Rome, but he was anxious to put off the fatal day till it was clearly inevitable. Unlike Cassius, he was still willing to live after he had witnessed

the collapse of his cause. His patriotism did not carry him so far as to throw his life away either for his friends or for his country; but only to save himself from personal dishonor.

On the other hand, this reading makes it clear that Shakespeare was as anxious as Plutarch to show that his Brutus was so highly esteemed by his own friends and by the adherents of his cause, and especially by the younger men, that they made every effort, and even sacrificed their own lives willingly, to save the life of Brutus. In Shakespeare's play only Cato and Lucilius appear to sacrifice themselves, but Plutarch says "there were slain in the field all the chiefest gentlemen and nobility that were in the army, who valiantly ran into any danger to save Brutus' life" (*Ibid.*, p. 148). Brutus was very evidently a favorite character with Shakespeare, as with Plutarch, and it is a pity that a printer's error has for these centuries obscured his attempt in this scene to illumine the last hours of his hero's life, by setting forth the personal esteem and affection enkindled in the friends who knew him best, and the patriotism and self-sacrifice he inspired in the younger generation.

A. W. Crawford.

University of Manitoba.

REVIEWS

The Dramatic Art of Lope de Vega, together with la Dama boba. Edited, from an autograph in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid, with notes by Rudolph Schevill. [University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 6, pp. 1-340.] Berkeley: University of California Press, 1918. vi + 340 pp.

All Hispanists are greatly indebted to Professor Schevill for his excellent edition of the original text of *La dama boba,* with its masterly introduction. In fact, Professor Schevill's account of the dramatic art of Lope de Vega is the most stimulating that I have read for many a day and, by the way, his definitions of *conceptismo* and *culto* or *culteranismo* (pages 49-50) are among the best I know.

With Professor Schevill's earnest plea that "a readable working

edition of the *comedias*" of Lope be made available, all must agree. He urges that the best plays be carefully chosen and published in "thirty or forty small volumes, each containing at the most three plays, carefully reprinted." What a boon to Hispanic studies this would be! All French plays by the great dramatists of the seventeenth century are available in scholarly editions, but for the most part this work is still to be done for the Spanish *comedias* of the Golden Age. There are few critical editions of the *comedias,* and in these editions numerous linguistic and literary problems still remain to be solved. This dearth of good texts may make the *comedias* a fascinating field for the investigator, but for the average student it makes them unduly difficult of comprehension.

Professor Schevill stresses the fact that Lope's *comedias* do not give an accurate description of contemporary life in Spain, but are largely colored by literary inheritance and tradition. In this respect it is interesting to compare Lope's plays with the comedies of Molière, and to note how both writers draw freely from traditional sources. Thus, in the works of both, the young gallant is accompanied by his servant, and the heroine by her attendant; there is much parallelism where the servants imitate the actions and even the words of their masters; only rarely is a mother brought into a play; and occasionally there is a wandering maiden disguised as a man. In these dramatic devices Molière has probably not imitated Lope, but both are using traditional material. Both writers, furthermore, champion the democratic spirit of the middle classes, and Lope, too, does not hesitate to make fun of the marquis (cf. *El bobo del colegio,* I, iii).

Professor Schevill gives in the body of his book a reprint of the autograph copy of *La dama boba* which now rests in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid. In the *Introduction* he gives the variants of the first printed edition, that of Madrid, 1617. The latter, according to Professor Schevill, seems to have been taken from "a fairly acceptable prompter's copy," which Lope, "in a letter to the Duke of Sessa, date [?] 1617," says that he signed. The variants are many, there being in all about 800. Some of them may be due to printer's errors, but I assume that most of them were made deliberately by actors or managers, or by Lope himself.

It would be interesting to examine carefully all these variants and determine so far as is possible why they were made. After

comparing them rather cursorily with Lope's original text, it has seemed to me that in the majority of cases the variants are superior to the original copy. By "superior" I mean that the revised text would satisfy both the actors and the audience to a greater degree. It would "act" better on the stage.

Some of the variants seem to be required, as (the variant is given in parenthesis): "que Nise ha dicho a mí," v. 2533. ("que Nise me ha dicho a mí"), where the original line lacked one syllable; "teneysme," v. 3005 ("tienesme"), where Otavio is using *tú;* "oye," v. 3013 ("oyd"), where Miseno uses *vos;* etc.

In some variants the meaning is clearer or more appropriate: "¿Que te dize?" v. 2613 ("Que te parece");

> y pues hablo claramente,
> hasta mañana a estas oras
> te doy para que lo pienses,
> porque de no te cassar,
> para que en tu vida entres,
> (quiero que en tu vida entres)
> por las puertas de mi casa
> que tan enfadada tienes,
> haz cuenta que eres poeta, vv. 2910-7;
>
> ¿Es coxa o manca Finea?
> ¿Es ciega? vv. 2903-4;
> (. . . es tuerta?).

In other variants the expression is less awkward:

> Escucha—ya escucho atento, v. 2498;
> (Escucha—ya estoy atento);
>
> ¿como no veys que en el çielo
> cada mes ay nuevas lunas, vv. 2540-1;
> (. . . ay luna nueva),
>
> me deys a mi esposa a mi, v. 2778;
> (me deys mi muger a mi);
>
> Yd, por Dios, tras el los dos, v. 2803;
> (Yd los dos tras el por Dios).

Of the last 246 lines of the original text fifty-six have been omitted from the printed copy, and forty-six other lines have been reduced to five, making a total elimination of ninety-seven lines. These omissions, for the most part, seem to me justifiable, for without them the play drags at the end where a quick and sudden

dénouement was the fashion. Lope has said in the *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias:*

> Pero la solución no la permita,
> hasta que llegue la postrera escena;
> porque en sabiendo el vulgo el fin que tiene,
> vuelve el rostro a la puerta, y las espaldas
> al que esperó tres horas cara a cara;
> que no hay más que saber que en lo que para.

The few variants given above were chosen almost at random from the last lines of the play. Nowhere do the variants alter to any considerable degree the basic material: they indicate usually a choice of words, and only rarely is the action modified at all.

When there exists an autograph copy of a play, written probably in haste by a great dramatist of a past age, and beside it a printed edition of a copy which we may assume to have been worked over by the actors until it suited their taste or that of the public before whom they performed it, there arises a curious problem. Which text has the greater value? If we desire to study the author and his works, the original text is the only one we need to consider seriously. But if we wish to know what dramatic material was popular at that time, an actor's or prompter's version is of the greatest importance.

In the case of the 1617 printed edition of *La dama boba,* the matter is complicated by the fact that Lope signed—or at least declares he signed—the copy that went to the printer. May he not himself have made or approved the variants after he had seen the play on the stage or perhaps after he had been present at several rehearsals?

These remarks do not in any way detract from the great service that Professor Schevill has rendered by giving us an edition of Lope's manuscript copy of *La dama boba.* We must have the original texts whenever it is possible to secure them, but I am convinced that further light can be thrown on the Spanish drama of the period by a careful comparison of original copies with those that were worked over by the actors or by the author and the actors jointly. Some linguistic data might also be obtained.

In the older printed editions it is usually impossible to ascertain the forms of words that the author actually used, since the printers were given to spelling words as they thought best. It may, there-

fore, be of interest to note how, in the autograph copy of *La dama boba,* Lope uses certain doublets (*así* and *ansí, ahora* and *agora,* etc.), and also *-ll-* for *-rl-* when the infinitive is followed by a personal pronoun beginning with *l* (*quitalla* for *quitarla,* etc.).

An examination of Professor Schevill's edition shows that *agora* is used twenty-six times; *a(h)ora,* three times. *A(h)ora* counts as two syllables; it is not found at the end of a line.

Así is used sixteen times; *ansí,* eight times. Lope prefers *ansí* at the end of a line (five times) or hemistich (twice). Only once (v. 2421) does *ansí* occur in an unstressed position. On the other hand, *así* occurs only once at the end of a line: "¡Linda bestia!—Assi, assi!" (v. 333). Here the variant gives: "Assi, si, si."

Mismo is used seven times; *mesmo,* not at all.

Twice Lope uses *-ld-* for *-dl-* in imperatives: "dalde" (v. 1618), "cassalda" (v. 2135). The first of these is omitted in the variant. I find in this play no use of *-dl-*.

Of verbal forms that retain the archaic *d,* there are six: "dixerades" (vv. 119, 223), "truxerades" (v. 517), "pudierades" (v. 2100), "erades" (v. 2535), "mostrassedes" (v. 2555). It is worthy of note that all but one end in *-rades.* Moreover, all but one are past subjunctives, and I find only one past subjunctive, second person plural, that does not have the *d,* namely "pudierays" (v. 939). Forms of the second person plural without *d* abound in other tenses, such as "veys," "hareys," etc.

In infinitives, *-rl-* occurs thirty-seven times; *-ll-,* fifteen times. The *-ll-* is used chiefly as a rime-word at the end of the line (ten times). But it usually rimes with another infinitive that has *-ll-,* and only twice does it rime with a noun or pronoun: "escusallo (v. 169) . . . caballo," "hazellos (v. 1402) . . . ellos." Once *-ll-* occurs at the end of a hemistich (v. 262), once it seems to be used by attraction to a following rime-word ("a no abrille ni tocalle," v. 274), three times it occurs within a line where there seems to be no reason for its use ("trahellos," vv. 1390, 1392; "quitalla," v. 2025), unless it be used in "trahellos" to avoid the recurrence of *r* (but "traerla," v. 2442). It is a curious fact that, of the fifteen infinitives with *-ll-,* only one (v. 2025) occurs in the second half of the play, and this one is not a rime-word.

The forms with *-rl-* occur thirty-seven times, but only six times at the end of a line. Four of these latter are in assonance, not in

complete rime; the other two do not rime at all. Evidently, at the time Lope wrote *La dama boba,* he preferred the forms in *-ll-* for verbs that bear the rhythmic stress, but he used them sparingly elsewhere.

The Notes to *La dama boba* are unusually full and instructive. The following changes or additions are suggested:

vv. 57, 59. Not infrequently with Lope *cristalina* and *cristal* are used as complimentary terms when referring to a young lady. See my comment on v. 2083 of *Amar sin saber a quién,* in *Modern Language Notes,* XXXVI, 284-293.

vv. 66-67 seem to mean: 'with nothing to eat save two bits of sugar.' Cf. "estoy en el aire" = "estoy sin comer."

v. 343. The line seems too long by one syllable. The variant is: "Di aqui: be, n, ben," which reads: Di a|qui: | be, | e, | e|ne, | ben (cf. v. 339).

v. 522. The syllabic division of the line is as follows: o|yd, | se|ño|ra, a E|du|ar|do.

v. 769. It might have been well to call attention to a similar doctrine in the writings of Dante and other poets of the *Dolce Stil Nuovo.* Thus, in the tenth sonnet of the *Vita Nuova,* Dante says:

> Amore e 'l cor gentil sono una cosa,
> Siccom' il Saggio in suo dittato pone;
> E così esser l'un senza l'altro osa,
> Com' alma razional senza ragione.
> Fagli natura, quando è amorosa,
> Amor per sire, e 'l cor per sua magione,
> Dentro alla qual dormendo si riposa
> Talvolta poca, e tal lunga stagione.
> Beltate appare in saggia donna pui,
> Che piace agli occhi sì, che dentro al core
> Nasce un desio della cosa piacente. . . .

Note also the well-known lines in the *Divina Commedia:*

> Amor, che al cor gentil ratto s'apprende,
> Prese costui della bella persona
> Che mi fu tolta, e il modo ancor m'offende.
>
> (*Inferno,* V, 100-102.)

v. 950. Spanish *jo,* like English 'whoa,' is the command to stop. Cf. Cobarruvias: "este termino usan los que quieren que la bestia se pare." The call of muleteers to their beasts to urge them on was, and is, *arre.* But this is doubtless a mere *lapsus calami* of the editor.

v. 1099 f. Note *amor* as the first word of several successive stanzas. This reminds one of v. 100 f. of the fifth canto of Dante's *Inferno.*

v. 1155 f. These are *décimas.* Note that each of three speakers has two *décimas.*

vv. 1483-4. A reference to the proverb: "No está bien el fuego cabe las estopas. Este proverbio nos advierte escusemos la mucha familiaridad con las mujeres peligrosas" (Cobarruvias, s. v. *estopa*). Correas, in his *Vocabulario de refranes,* gives a more modern version: "No está bien la estopa junto al fuego."

v. 1600. The retention of *y* and the omission of *bien* would make a good eleven-syllable line, with the inner rhythmic accent on the sixth syllable. This and following lines were omitted from the printed edition.

v. 1741-3. Is this a poor pun?

v. 1813. "Luz va tiniendo ya pienso; que bien pienso, . . ." The substitution of *que bien sé* for *que bien pienso* would not make the verse *endecasílabo.* The omission of *ya* would make the line metrically correct, but the variant is better: "Luz va tomando ya, por cierto creo."

v. 2033 f. These are *décimas.* As this is a soliloquy, the *décima* may be added to the list of metrical arrangements mentioned at the bottom of page 98.

The last lines of the first *décima* attribute to love some of the virtues that the Archpriest of Hita attributes to gold:

Mucho faz' el dinero, mucho es de amar:
Al torpe faze bueno é ome de prestar,
Ffaze correr al coxo é al mudo fablar,

El que no tiene manos dyneros quier' tomar.
Sea un ome nesçio é rudo labrador,
Los dyneros le fazen fidalgo é sabydor,
Quanto más algo tiene, tanto es de más valor;
El que non há dineros, non es de sy señor.
(Arcipreste de Hita, *Libro de buen amor*, ed. Cejador, I, 182.)

v. 2053 f. Note that this *décima* does not have a pause at the end of the fourth line, as is usual in the *espinela*. There is sometimes, as here, a pause after the sixth line, instead of the fourth, but there cannot be a marked pause after the fifth line.

v. 2120. Lope also mentions Cervantes in *Amar sin saber a quién*, v. 123.

vv. 2225-8. These lines, and vv. 2233-6, seem to be *seguidillas*.

v. 2238. May not *vanda* — or *banda* — refer to a sash either denoting rank or worn merely to sustain a sword or dagger (cf. v. 2263)? In Rojas, *Del rey abajo ninguno*, I, after v. 401, the *banda* is that of the *Orden de Caballería de la Banda*.

v. 2242. I am told that the French *poilus* call Paris *Panama*, as being a place of great wealth.

v. 2293. This ten-syllable line has a marked ternary movement.

v. 2440, note: *cordera* should be *cordero*.

v. 2533. Both meter and grammar require *me* before *ha*, as in the variant.

v. 2813. *Fenia* should be *Finea*.

v. 3037. *vieran:* a good example of verbal forms in *-ara* or *-iera* used as a pluperfect subjunctive. This is not unusual in Lope's works.

v. 3126 f. Note that Finea, who is indignant, uses the third person when addressing her father. In v. 3137 she uses the pronoun *él*.[1]

E. C. Hills.

Indiana University.

[1] In a recent letter Professor Schevill suggests the following emendations:
v. 87. "Liseo" should be in italics.
v. 259. Put a comma before and after "Miseno," and omit the note.
v. 580. "*Duardo. Platon.*" These words are a part of v. 579, and should precede "a lo que," etc. This is a printer's error.
v. 858. should have a comma at the end.

Le origini di "Salammbô" by Luigi Foscolo Benedetto, studio del realismo storico di Gustave Flaubert. Publicazioni del R. Istituto di Studi Superiori Pratici e di Perfezionamente in Firenze. Sezione di Filologia e Filosofia. N. S. Vol. I., Firenze, Bemporad e Figlio, 1920. Pp. 333 + 14 (index).

This work is the first attempt at an *étude d'ensemble* of the sources of *Salammbô*. The author does not announce a study of all the sources of all the elements of the novel, but his reader wonders occasionally what unexpressed principle guided him, as when he leaves out of consideration the comparison of Flaubert's campaign with its sources.[1] This, to be sure, had been done by Fay,[2] as the sources of the religious element had been examined by Hamilton,[3] but Mr. Benedetto is often none too content with the work of his predecessors.[4]

[1] Perhaps because he had done this in *Atene e Roma*, 1919, pp. 39-48: "L'interpretazione filologica di Polibio in *Salammbô*," where his findings are less favorable to Flaubert the historian than, on the whole, in the present volume.

[2] P. B. Fay and A. Coleman: "Sources and Structure of *Salammbô*," Elliott Monographs, no. 2, Baltimore, 1914.

[3] Arthur Hamilton: "Sources of the Religious Element in *Salammbô*," Elliott Monographs. no. 4, Baltimore, 1917.

[4] Of the studies of Abrami and Ferrère he says (p. 17, n.): "ma sono assolutamente insufficienti." In the same note he refers to the "critica spicciola" of Pézard and of Trévières. Of the latter he says (p. 109, n.): "gli appunti di Trévières . . . a questo riguardo sono privi di senso." One of his remarks on Hamilton's study is both querulous and misleading. To the discussion of the sources of Salammbô's prayer (p. 120), he adds in a note: "A. Hamilton . . . è qui, come del resto in quasi tutti gli appunti ond'è costituito il suo volumetto, vittima di un errore fondamentale: non gli passa pel capo che il Flaubert abbia utilizzato direttamente le fonti classiche e crede indicarci la vera fonte col trascriverci qualche allusione moderna." He continues that in this case H. refers merely to a paraphrase of the prayer in the *Mém. de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1786, adding: "è quella l'unica fonte di cui si contenta lo Hamilton." The fact is that in this case H. cites, in addition, Pliny, Plutarch, and Creuzer (pp. 5-8), and his bibliographical appendix (pp. 119-123) indicates how unfounded the general statement is. It would be more exact to say that H. seems to assume that Flaubert used translations instead of Greek or Latin originals, whereas Benedetto assumes the contrary. No one could pronounce a judgment on this very nice point without considerable study. A reader of the letters of Flaubert with their constant references to his browsings in the classical field will agree that

The volume before us is divided into two parts; each part into five chapters. Part I, entitled *L'eredità romantica,* discusses the early enthusiasm of Flaubert for the Orient; the very definite traces in *Salammbô* of the effects of his journey in the East with Ducamp; the episodes and motifs found in the first *Saint Antoine* that reappear in *Salammbô;* the evidences in the novel of the influence of Michelet, of Chateaubriand, of Gautier (*le Roman de la momie*); and the survival of such romantic elements as a fondness for scenes of horror. Most of this ground has been examined in preceding studies. Mr. Benedetto, however, makes clearer the debt of *Salammbô* to the author's experiences and previous literary activity. He inclines to the well-known view that the first suggestion for the novel came from Michelet's *Histoire romaine* (p. 66). More interesting and more suggestive is his discussion of Chateaubriand as a source for certain elements of *Salammbô.* Like Sainte-Beuve, he thinks that *les Martyrs* was of more importance in the conception of the character of the heroine than the author was willing to admit (p. 69 *sq.*), though he makes one or two rather forced comparisons.[5]

Interesting, too, is the discussion in chapter five of Flaubert's insistence on the horrible. One must make allowance for the ironical exaggeration in certain well-known passages of his letters of the time (e. g., *Corr.* III, p. 301), but it is clear that contempt for the bourgeois—that is, for mankind—which, in most of the romantics was a pose, more or less founded on temperament, had become with Flaubert a fundamental pessimism, and that he was not sorry, in depicting life in Carthage, to draw up a black indictment against his kind. As Benedetto observes (p. 84), "Ogni

it is unwise to assume that he read Apuleius in translation. In fact the comparisons made by Benedetto (pp. 120-123) indicate that he had in mind the Latin text of the prayers of Lucius to Isis and of Psyche to Ceres.

Of interest in this connection are two quotations: "Si je savais le grec au moins, et j'y ai perdu tant de temps!" (*Corr.* II, p. 14, 1850); and "Depuis dix-huit jours . . . j'ai lu . . . la grande hymne à Cérès (dans les *Poésies homériques* en grec) . . ." (*Corr.* III, p. 190, 1858).

[5] E. g. "Leggiamo nei *Martyrs:* 'les chars roulaient vers le stade'; in *Salammbô:* 'les grands chariots . . . faisaient tourner leurs roues sur les dalles des rues.' L'immagine flaubertiana, 'les citernes remplies avaient l'air de boucliers d'argent perdus dans les cours' è stata probabilmente ispirata dagli 'scudi persiani appesi al frontone del portico' che il Chateaubriand fa risplendenti ai 'fuochi del vespero'" (pp. 71-72).

lettore è sorpreso dal compiacimento con cui accoglio nel suo libro il documento eccentrico, la rarità, la stranezza impressionante, tanto che *Salammbô* ha qualche volta l'aria di un 'sottisier,' di una grande caricatura della vita antica."

Part II is entitled "Il lavoro di ricostruzione." In the five chapters Mr. Benedetto examines the sources of Flaubert's attempt to reconstruct the topography of the city, the Carthaginian religion, the government of the city-state, the organization of its armies, and the ethnical character of its people. The chapter on religion is much the longest, but in view of Hamilton's detailed study of the same subject, it contains less new material than the other chapters of this part.

Upon examination of Flaubert's conception of the geography and plan of the city, one finds that he utilized the best studies of his day on Carthaginian archæology, but Benedetto points out the curious fact that in the Carthage of *Salammbô* the points of the compass are somewhat shifted. Flaubert makes the isthmus stretch south-southwest toward the mainland instead of due west (p. 89), which allows his sun to set over the waves instead of behind a land horizon. Otherwise he relied chiefly on Dureau de la Malle and on Appian, filling in with details in order to give the picture more precision, but never succeeding in sketching a Carthage of which the reader gets an adequate visual image.

The fundamental sources for the religious element, according to Mr. Benedetto, are Apuleius, the Pseudo-Lucianic *De dea syria,* and Diodorus Siculus. He is inclined to deprecate the importance generally assigned to Creuzer—who, however, drew generously on these very sources—, of Falbe, of Dureau de la Malle, whose works were, in Hamilton's opinion (*op. cit.,* pp. 106-167), Flaubert's main reliance. The reviewer cannot pronounce a judgment. A detailed study of the question would be necessary.[6]

The passages in which Mr. Benedetto discusses Flaubert's basic conception of the Carthaginian religion (pp. 141 ff.) constitute his

[6] It would seem that Hamilton is correct in considering that Creuzer is one of the sources for *Salammbô's* prayer (Benedetto, pp. 120-123); that the Biblical source given in *Elliott Monographs,* number 2, p. 46, for Salammbo's abstention from wine and meat and the defilement of the house of death is more convincing than the comparison with Apuleius (B., p. 125); and that Aelian's "Natural History" is, as Hamilton asserts, the source for the details about the lions in the temple of Moloch.

most interesting contribution. Hamilton's monograph covered very thoroughly what we may call the physical sources, the texts that supplied the raw material of characteristic and picturesque details. Benedetto examines the leading ideas that dominate Flaubert's version of the theology of Carthage. His work, then, is interpretative and critical, in addition to being a study of origins. In fact, as regards sources, he adds but little to Hamilton's findings.[7] His particular interest lies in interpreting Flaubert's view of the rôle of religion in Carthage.

He points out (pp. 141-149) that Flaubert correctly conceived of Carthaginian faith as founded on belief in a dual divine principle, Tanit-Baal, instead of in the triad, Tanit-Baal-Eschmoun, accepted by most of his modern sources, and that this view is sound both in fact and artistically. Only so could he clearly bring out the opposition between the two deities in the struggle symbolized by the fate of the leading characters. On the other hand he holds (pp. 152 ff.) that Flaubert committed an anachronism in identifying Juno Punica with Tanit, though his evidence does not show that the novelist failed in this respect to follow accepted authorities. The same comment is to be made on the critic's protest against Flaubert's identification of Kronos with Moloch instead of with Baal-Khamon (pp. 206-208). He shows (pp. 173 ff.) that Flaubert, in making the famous *peplos* the mantle of Tanit and the *palladium* of Carthage, acted on neither historical nor legendary evidence, despite the warmth of his reply to Sainte-Beuve.

In pursuance of the interesting view that the whole novel is dominated by the religious element, of greater importance are Benedetto's interpretation of the violation of the temple of Tanit as a sort of initiation ceremony (pp. 187 ff.), his conception of the incidents of the chapter *Sous la tente* as constituting a sacrifice to Tanit (p. 185), and of Salammbô and Mâtho—themselves repre-

[7] Compare Flaubert's interest in the Diana of Ephesus seen by him at Naples as one source for one of the representations of Tanit (pp. 46, 168); the passage from Tertullian on human sacrifice in ancient Carthage (p. 201); Benedetto's belief that the Biblical episode of the destruction of the prophets of Baal (I Kings, xviii) had much to do with the genesis of the sacrifice to Moloch (pp. 198-199); his argument that the different stages of the progress of Spendius and Mâtho through the temple of Tanit reflect the initiation ceremonies described in Apuleius (pp. 187-192).

sentative of the opposing divine principles—as symbolic of the primitive and passionate nature of oriental love as imagined by Flaubert (pp. 245 ff.). To approach the novel from this point of view is to give it greater dignity. It becomes apparent that Flaubert's long and arduous labors, of which so much has been said, were not undertaken primarily to gather picturesque and extraordinary details. He studied Carthaginian history, beliefs, and institutions chiefly in order to arrive at an understanding of the people. He came to believe that the Oriental discloses himself most completely through his religion, and this belief determined very largely his conception of the book. Mr. Benedetto has thus done Flaubert a great service. Previous students have not taken seriously enough his oft-quoted cry: "Je me moque de l'archéologie! Si la couleur n'est pas une, si les détails détonnent, si les mœurs ne dérivent pas de la religion et les faits des passions, . . . s'il n'y a pas, en un mot, harmonie, je suis dans le faux" (*Corr.* III, p. 343).

Flaubert met greater difficulties in his attempt to reconstruct the Carthaginian state. The topic was less congenial and scanty information was available. Hence the political organization of Carthage is meagerly and not over-clearly indicated on the basis of Aristotle's *Politica* and of Livy. Only two concepts stand out clearly: the plutocratic character of the ruling oligarchy and their fierce opposition to domination by a single man.

The military organization of Carthage was depicted after Polybius and Herodotus. The most important characters in the struggle were largely the novelist's own creation: Mâtho, a sort of Bug-Jargal, and Spendius, his antithesis, an adaptation of Plutarch's Aratus. His endeavor was to depict the armies, not as an indiscriminate horde, but as a composite of different races, distinguished by their weapons, their religious practices, their differing temperaments. His subject, as Benedetto remarks, was not so much the war against the mercenaries as ancient warfare in general. He was thus free to scour antiquity for precise and vivid details.

In contrast with many critics (e. g., Sainte-Beuve, the Goncourts, Faguet), Benedetto holds that the characters of the novel are to a very considerable degree individually and racially distinct. The chief Punic traits that Flaubert found in his sources were superstition, greed, fondness for ceremony, cruelty, faithlessness.

Thus the people are typified in Hannon and Hamilcar, the latter, drawn largely from what is known about Hannibal and representing the noblest aspects of Carthaginian nature.

In his conclusion Mr. Benedetto recognizes the artist's failure to reproduce entirely his own vision, to keep out of the novel his own sense of weariness. The historical material was often an incumbrance. Yet it was a fundamental condition of the subject. The subject itself, then, is the real weakness. Flaubert recognized that he must exaggerate, must magnify his characters to the point of melodrama in order to give them the proper relief. And such crimson patches stand beside passages in which he reproduces from his sources tiny details of life and customs as though for a scholarly article. His fundamental romantic pessimism made him a satirist in *Salammbô,* despite the abundance of the exotic splendor in which he delighted; it made him a satirist of his kind in the *Education sentimentale,* where the drabness of modern life renders more hopeless a picture unrelieved by color, light, the movements of huge masses, eastern richness. These two volumes, apparently so different, express therefore the same principle, their author's most intimate judgment of life.

Source studies on Flaubert have usually lacked an organizing principle. They have been concerned with details, with the external world of *Salammbô,* rather than with its inner meaning. It is evident that the author of this new study, in addition to his special competence in classical and oriental archæology, is possessed of critical discernment and literary acumen. Therefore, his well-written and well-printed book, appearing on the eve of the celebration of the centennial of Flaubert's birth, has unusual importance. The author expresses the wish that it may serve as a sort of handbook to the novel. It can do so, of course, only to serious readers, and will not lead to the founding of many *Salammbô* clubs, but the serious reader may address himself to its perusal with the confident expectation that the novel will thereby gain in richness and significance.

A. Coleman.

The University of Chicago.

CORRESPONDENCE

A Poem in the Collins Canon

The *Song: The sentiments borrowed from Shakespeare,* printed with Collins's works since Johnson's *English Poets* (1790), has always been felt to be of doubtful authenticity. Professor Bronson discovered that it appeared anonymously in the *Public Advertiser,* March 7, 1788;[1] it has not been shown that the verses had appeared earlier. Thirty years later we find the same piece positively attributed to another man. William Beloe, in *The Sexagenarian; or, the Recollections of a Literary Life,*[2] prints the song as the work of Henry Headley (1765-1788), best known as the editor of *Select Beauties of Ancient English Poetry.* Beloe is not always trustworthy, but he writes as a friend of Headley's; and on the evidence at hand Headley's authorship seems at least as probable as Collins's. At least one other poem in the *Public Advertiser,* where our song appeared, was ascribed to Headley.[3] He wrote an *Ode to the Memory of Chatterton* in the metre of the *Ode to Evening,* with diction reminiscent of Collins. Similarly the song in question might be an imitation of Collins's *Song from Shakespear's Cymbelyne.* Chronologically it is easier to associate the poem with Headley, who died in the year of its appearance in the *Advertiser,* than with Collins, who had died almost thirty years before. Whether or not we give the song to Headley, we have less reason than ever to give it to Collins.

Alan D. McKillop.

The Rice Institute.

A Brief Rejoinder

The notice of my *Study of Metre* which appeared in your January issue over well-known initials has interested me so much that I ask leave to add a few further words on the subject. Prosody is indeed "a fair field full of fighting folk" (Saintsbury), but critics have nothing to complain of when weapons are wielded with the skill and urbanity shown by your contributor (or should I say, editor?).

He makes one important pronouncement when he says that

[1] *The Poems of William Collins* (Athenaeum Press Series), p. 80.
[2] Second edition, London, 1817, I, pp. 173-179.
[3] Thomas Park, *Works of the British Poets,* London, 1808, XLI, p. 41.

"in versification the language is under the dominion of an art that is not the art of prose-utterance." With this I cordially agree. Many writers, on the other hand, seem to think that when they have determined the natural prose utterance of a verse-line there is nothing more to be said. A familiar line of Milton's is therefore thus scanned (bar-marks preceding accents):

| Better to | reign in | hell than | serve in | heaven. But this prose sentence does not become verse till we relate it in some way to the metrical rhythm which enables us to feel that every line of *Paradise Lost* is in that particular form of metre commonly called "heroic."

The natural prose sense-rhythm and the metrical rhythm may be represented by two wavy lines, one above the other, and then the point of interest is to see whether the two sets of wave-crests always coincide. Professor Bright holds that they do; that if we attend to secondary and other subtle sub-accents which are neglected in prose, we can always make them agree. I cannot go quite so far. To me the metrical rhythm is an affair of the mind, which on occasion can dispense with physical support. When once a pattern has been firmly impressed on the mind, a poet can trust us to maintain it even when for reasons of his own he prefers to leave it now and again without such physical aid. Of course the two sets of crests do usually coincide. That is obvious, and it is obviously the means by which a poet makes his rhythm known to us. But to say that there are no exceptions to this, that coincidence must be invariable, seems to me warranted neither by reason nor by history. Such a view ignores the "conflict" which, denied by many prosodists (e. g. Saintsbury III, 439), I hold to be a frequent factor in our verse-structure—one of the components, indeed, of that charm which characterizes the best English verse and which perhaps can never be wholly explained. This opinion, I regret to say, I retain even after studying the "crucial examples" in *Elements of English Versification.*

I am far from thinking that "routine scansion" is a mere matter of syllable-counting; rather I regard it as the basic principle of mental metrical rhythm. And I fear that acceptance of isochronous units in rhythm is by no means so universal as my reviewer suggests. When my *Study* was first published, some critics here regarded my assertion of this, covering silences as well as sounds, as revolutionary; and to this day there are important writers who deny equality in "measures," substituting for it other ratios. One of these, if I mistake not, is Dr. W. Thomson of Glasgow.

It is pleasant to think that American prosody is in little danger of running into strange courses while it has guidance so sane and well-informed as it at present enjoys. Your poets may put forward wild and formless attempts at *vers libre,* but the common sense

of students, as well as of the general public, will revolt against these and demand adherence to, not artificial rules, but the deepest fundamental principles of rhythmical utterance.

T. S. Omond.

Tunbridge Wells, England.

Jottings

Sainte-Beuve, staying at Aigues Mortes, wrote in 1839 the following words: "My soul is like this beach, where it is said St. Louis embarked: The sea and faith, alas, have long since drawn away." I am wondering whether these words did not suggest to Matthew Arnold the familiar lines of *Dover Beach:*

> The Sea of Faith
> Was once, too, at the full, and round earth's shore
> Lay like the folds of a bright girdle furl'd.
> But now I only hear
> Its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar,
> Retreating to the breath
> Of the night wind, down the vast edges drear
> And naked shingles of the world.

Perhaps I am not the first to notice the coincidence, but it seems to me that the reference to St. Louis in the quotation from the French critic adds force to the lines of the English poet.

2. While I am writing I should like to draw attention to the orthographical error in Browning's *The Ring and the Book* (The Pope) by which the Chinese Province of *Fu-kien* (Fokien) is spoken of as *To-kien.*

> Five years since in the Province of *To-kien,*
> Which is in China as some people know.

I have sought in vain to learn whether the change of F into T is Browning's own error or the result of faulty proof-reading in the original edition. The owner of the MS. has not replied to my letter on the subject,—possibly did not receive it.

Curiously enough, Voltaire, in his poem on *The Nature of Man* has made precisely the opposite error of turning a T into an F in the line: "Their secret thoughts were all to *Fien* known": where the *Fien* is, of course, a mistake for the Chinese *Tien* ('Heaven').

Herbert H. Gowen.

University of Washington.

Flaubert and War-Brides

Contradictions in Flaubert's temperament have been analyzed by all the critics. Here is the manifestation of one which may be

piquant to-day. Flaubert held the artist's hatred of armed conflict. He writes to George Sand in 1870: "Moi, je suis écœuré, navré, par la bêtise de mes compatriotes. L'irrémédiable barbarie de l'humanité m'emplit d'une tristesse noire. Cet enthousiasme, qui n'a pour mobile aucune idée, me donne envie de crever pour ne plus le voir. Le bon Français veut se battre: 1° parce qu'il se croit provoqué par la Prusse; 2° parce que l'état naturel de l'homme est la sauvagerie; 3° parce que la guerre contient en soi un élément mystique qui transporte les foules. . . . Ah! que ne puis-je vivre chez les Bédouins!"[1] Later he became himself a lieutenant of militia, but writes to George Sand: "J'en veux à mes contemporains de m'avoir donné des sentiments d'une brute du XIIe siècle! Le fiel m'étouffe!" He notes the brutalizing effects of war on both sides, foresees that Europe is to become an armed camp and that "la revanche" is to become the watch-word of his country. "Le meurtre en grand va être le but de tous nos efforts, l'idéal de la France! . . . Attendons-nous à des hypocrisies nouvelles: déclamations sur la vertu, diatribes sur la corruption, austérité d'habits etc. Cuistrerie complète!"[2]

In the preface to the *Correspondance,* Maupassant tells us of various plans of the master for unfinished stories and novels. "Il comptait écrire d'abord le *Combat des Thermopyles* et il devait accomplir un voyage en Grèce au commencement de l'année 1882 pour voir le paysage réel de cette lutte surhumaine. Il voulait faire de cela une sorte de récit patriotique simple et terrible, qu'on pourrait lire aux enfants de tous les peuples pour leur apprendre l'amour du pays. Il voulait montrer les âmes vaillantes, les cœurs magnanimes et les corps vigoureux de ces héros symboliques, et, sans employer un mot technique, ni un terme ancien, dire cette bataille immortelle qui n'appartient pas à l'histoire d'une nation, mais à l'histoire du monde. Il se réjouissait à l'idée d'écrire en termes sonores les adieux de ces guerriers recommandant à leurs femmes, s'ils mouraient dans la rencontre, d'épouser vite des hommes robustes pour donner de nouveaux fils à la patrie. La pensée seule de ce conte féerique jetait Flaubert dans un enthousiasme violent."[3]

If this plan had been carried out it would have made of Flaubert a welcome ally of all of the late belligerents. Was his real purpose to teach patriotism to children? Would this not be *cuistrerie complète?* The explanation is surely to be found in the lyric and epic side of his nature. His artistic theory was based on the idea that "tout acte bon ou mauvais n'a pour l'écrivain qu'une importance comme sujet à écrire, sans qu'une idée de bien ou de mal

[1] *Correspondance avec George Sand.* P. 115.
[2] *Ibid.* Pp. 130-131.
[3] Préface. Pp. lv-lvi.

puisse y être attachée: il vaut plus ou moins comme document littéraire et voilà tout." Which would seem to justify the philistine's contemptuous " C'est de la littérature, tout ça ! "

BENJAMIN M. WOODBRIDGE.

University of Texas.

THE RÔLE OF THE GHOST IN *Hamlet*

The consensus of criticism is that the play of *Hamlet* is Hamlet; and there's an end. But Shakspere has given an analysis of *Hamlet*. It is a drama of *casual, bloody, and unnatural acts;* a drama in which every personage in his time plays many parts. The Ghost, for one, has a greater rôle than is generally conceded. His interference in III, iv is the turning point in the play.

The pause between

> And now I'll do't

and

> And so he goes to heaven

is considered the climax of *Hamlet*. From the point of view of dramatic structure that is true. Hamlet has let slip the opportunity to kill Claudius. In the next scene the tragedies of the play are unchained. But we must recognize two sets of tragedies in *Hamlet*. There are the tragedies of Polonius, Guildenstern, etc., and there are the tragedies of Claudius, of Hamlet, of Gertrude. The deaths of Ophelia and the courtiers are but the small annexment that attends the boisterous ruin. Another reason for the view held of this passage is that it has been assumed that the Ghost's message and Hamlet's sole object is to kill Claudius.

Gertrude is uppermost in the mind of her son. When Hamlet learns that Claudius is the serpent that has stung King Hamlet, his first curse is for the most pernicious woman, his mother. The more villainous is Claudius, the more abject Gertrude's marriage to him. A greater crime has been committed than the murder of King Hamlet; the royal bed of Denmark has been made

> A couch for luxury and damned incest.

And in Hamlet's heart there is the hope that his mother might be made to redeem herself.

Gertrude is uppermost in the mind of Claudius. It is to possess her that he has killed his brother. He enumerates the prizes of his crime:

> My crown, mine own ambition, and my queen.

The queen is at the top of the series.

She's so conjunctive to my life and soul,
That, as the star moves not but in his sphere,
I could not but by her.

Claudius consents to Polonius' scheme. He is playing his all. Gertrude has seen in *the Murder of Gonzago* Hamlet's accusation against Claudius. A conversation with her son will prove to her either that Claudius has murdered King Hamlet or that Hamlet is insane.

The situation is therefore such when Hamlet enters his mother's closet that the victory will be with the faction with which the queen will side.

Queen. O Hamlet, speak no more,
Thou turn'st mine eyes into my very soul,
And there I see such black and grained spots
As will not leave their tinct.

Enter Ghost.

Queen. Alas, he is mad.

There is the climax in the tragedy of Gertrude; and there is the turning point of the play.

Hamlet. It is not madness
That I have utter'd; bring me to the test.

Hamlet has lost his audience.

Queen. What shall I do?

This question is not addressed to Hamlet. One does not ask advice of the insane. The queen has heard of Hamlet's pranks; but she has not dared to believe him mad until before her very eyes he held discourse with the incorporal air. In her fear of the madman Gertrude has sided with Claudius.

MAURICE BAUDIN.

Miami University.

A NOTE ON MAUPASSANT

Petronius' skill as a story teller is nowhere more convincing than in his burlesque portrayals of faithless widows. The most famous of such tales is perhaps that of the *Widow of Ephesus*[1] with which Eumolpus enlivens a company of weary sailors. It is interesting to compare this sprightly tale of the Latin humorist with one of Maupassant's stories, *Les tombales.*[2] So striking is

[1] Titus Petronius Arbiter: *Satyricon*, in the Loeb Classical Library Edition, pp. 229 *et seq.* The story is also found in more condensed form in Phaedrus' *Fabulae* (appendix 13).

[2] *Œuvres de Guy de Maupassant: La maison Tellier.*

the similarity at least in the essential elements of the plot that one is almost justified in assuming evidence of a possible relationship, with La Fontaine, perhaps, as an intermediary. In both stories, the narrative seems to converge upon this central idea: the psychological fascination of an extraordinary setting. In both a woman rouses the deepest sympathy of a man, an utter stranger to her, by displaying a seemingly deep grief over the tomb of a dead husband. A mere outline of the two stories would be inadequate for a satisfactory comparison. They should be read in their entirety.

A. Marinoni.

University of Arkansas.

St. Cuthbert and the King's Daughter

In the twenty-seventh chapter of the Irish *Libellus de Ortu Sancti Cuthberti* we read that a king's daughter who had been seduced by a young man falsely accused St. Cuthbert of being responsible for her condition. The Saint prayed God to clear him of the charge, if need be, by a miracle, whereupon the earth opened and swallowed her up and she descended into hell.

This legend is strikingly similar to the Buddhist legend of Chinchā.

The Latin text of the Christian legend will be found in *Miscellanea Biographica,* Publications of the Surtees Society, vol. 8 (1838), pp. 83-84; English translation in *Rites of Durham,* ed. J. T. Fowler, Surtees Society, vol. 107 (1902), pp. 35-37. On the date of the *Libellus,* see J. Raine, *Dictionary of Christian Biography,* vol. 1, p. 729, col. 1.

The Buddhist legend forms the Introduction to *Jātaka* 472: text, vol. IV, pp. 187-189; translated by W. H. D. Rouse, vol. IV, pp. 116-117. The legend also occurs in the *Dhammapada Commentary,* XIII, 9: text, vol. III, pp. 178-181; translated by E. W. Burlingame, *Buddhist Legends,* Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 30, pp. 19-22.

It would seem likely that later versions of this Irish legend were in circulation on the Continent during the middle ages. If so, will some reader point them out?

E. W. Burlingame.

Yale University.

An Erroneous Ascription to Wyatt

The editors of Sir Thomas Wyatt have persisted in printing as his composition a poem entitled *An Epitaph of Sir Thomas Gravenor, Knight.* This poem was not written by Wyatt. The only Sir Thomas Gravenor (Grosvenor, Gravener) Wyatt could have known died in 1549, or 1550.[1] The date of Wyatt's death is Oct. 10, or 11, 1542.[2] The conclusion is obvious. This poem should not, therefore, be ascribed to Wyatt or used as illustrative of Italian [3] influence on him.

D. T. Starnes.

The Rice Institute.

BRIEF MENTION

Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech, by Edward Sapir (New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1921. vii + 258 pp.). The author of this book is introduced to the public on the publishers' paper cover, the "jacket," as "Chief of the Anthropological Section, Geological Survey of Canada. One of the most brilliant students of primitive language in America." The book justifies the complimentary words of this introduction. The author's preface is brief, altogether too brief and compressed in style to be as alluring as the character of the book would have warranted. The main purpose, it is declared, "is to show what I conceive language to be, what is its variability in place and time, and what are its relations

[1] For evidence of the varied spelling of the name Grosvenor, see *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, ed. Gairdner and Brodie, London, 1905, XVIII, (11) 436 (f 29), in which, in the year 1537, the name of the prioress of Chester appears as Elizabeth Grosvenor, and Grosbenour, and Grosvoner. In 1543, the name of this prioress appears as Elizabeth Gravenor (*Ibid.*, XII, (1) 311 (39). Elizabeth Grosvenor, the prioress of Chester, was a sister to Sir Thomas Grosvenor (Gravenor), the subject of the epitaph ascribed to Wyatt (cf. Collins, *The Peerage of England*, 1779, VIII, 70; cf. also, Burke, *Peerage*, etc. (1910) under "Westminster"). In 1549, Sir Thomas Grosvenor, under the name Sir Thomas Gravenor, had grants from Richard Hough and John Gravenor of lands in Pulton and Doddleston (Ormerod, *The History of the County Palatine and City of Chester.* Second edition revised and enlarged by Thomas Helsby, London, 1882. 3 vols., vol. II, p. 836). The accounts of the Grosvenors by Ormerod, Collins, and Burke satisfactorily identify Sir Thomas Grosvenor as the subject of this epitaph, and show that Sir Thomas died late in the year 1549 or early in 1550; as on June 30, 1550, the king granted the wardships of his lands during the minority of his son and heir, Thomas Grosvenor, to Sir Wm. Paget.

[2] Cf. *DNB.*, &c., &c.

[3] Miss Foxwell cites this epitaph as illustrative of one phase of Trissino's influence on Wyatt. *The Poems of Sir Thomas Wiat, . . .* London, 1913. 2 vols. Vol. II, App. E, pp. 250-251.

to other fundamental human interests—the problem of thought, the nature of the historical process, race, culture, art. . . . Quite aside from their intrinsic interest, linguistic forms and historical processes have the greatest possible diagnostic value for the understanding of some of the more difficult and elusive problems in the psychology of thought and in the strange, cumulative drift in the life of the human spirit that we call history or progress or evolution. This value depends chiefly on the unconscious and unrationalized nature of linguistic structure." Now, that is a type of compression by which more is lost than gained. It does not kindle in the average mind—the mind here addressed—a fresh interest; nor is it satisfactory to the technical mind that demands no vague generalizations but rather an articulated analysis of plan and purpose. The preface would therefore seem to prepare one to find in the book some marks of a not fully matured method of popularizing the author's extensive knowledge, and these are not altogether lacking. But for the most part his style is attractively clear, his arguments direct and aptly illustrated, and his enthusiasm genuine and unfaltering.

The author's observation of linguistic facts and principles ranges over the greater portion of the map of the world; but English is the basic source of illustrative material, and notably numerous are the references to the languages of the American Indians; other "exotic instances," however, are surprisingly numerous and brought from almost every known language, to demonstrate "the protean forms in which human thought has found expression." From this anthropological point of view, the author has discussed his subject in a manner that has a peculiar value.

A few expressions selected from the introductory chapter, entitled "Language Defined," will show how the subject is approached. "Speech is a non-instinctive, acquired, 'cultural' function." As to the untenable theory of the onomatopoetic origin of speech, it is observed that the languages of primitive peoples "show no particular preference for imitative words;" that "such words seem to be nearly or entirely absent" in some of the aboriginal tribes of America, "while they are used freely enough in languages as sophisticated as English and German (p. 6). . . . "Many primitive languages," moreover, "have a formal richness, a latent luxuriance of expression, that eclipses anything known to the languages of modern civilization" (p. 22). Here is also expounded the basic fact that "there are, properly speaking, no organs of speech; there are only organs that are incidentally useful in the production of speech sounds. . . . Speech is not a simple activity that is carried on by one or more organs biologically adapted to the purpose. It is an extremely complex and ever-shifting network of adjustments—in the brain, in the nervous system, and in the articulating and auditory organs—tending towards the desired end of communica-

tion" (p. 7). It follows from this that speech is "a group of overlaid functions" (p. 8). Can we think and reason without language? This old question is answered with a philosophic negative, clothed in fresh metaphors: "thought may in some cases run along outside the fringe of the conscious mind," giving the impression of a "non-linguistic stream of thought," and the cerebral equivalents of speech may be "touched off so lightly during the process of thought as not to rise into consciousness at all. This would be a limiting case—thought riding lightly on the submerged crests of speech" (p. 15).

To read the second chapter, on "The Elements of Speech," is to be convinced of the author's fine discernment of grammatical principles. As here set forth, the psychological validity of word and of sentence deserves wider attention in educational circles than will probably be paid to it in these days when grammar is subjected to pedagogical under-valuation and has even become a chartered theme for persuasive repudiation. The components of word and sentence are analyzed, and the expression of a concept distinguished as concrete, abstract, or purely relational. Instructive is the treatment of the "unessential parts" of a sentence, which provide the basis for an individual style; and with this is connected a consideration of the volitional and emotional aspects of consciousness. "Emotion, indeed, is proverbially inclined to be speechless" (p. 39) is a profound statement. It leads to a discussion of "feeling-tones of words." These are "of great value to the literary artist," but they also offer pitfalls, for they tend to degenerate into "a plushy bit of furniture, a *cliché*," which the artist must avoid (p. 42).

Without a good elementary knowledge of the physics of speech sounds, of the physiology of the organs of speech, and of the systematization of speech-sounds, the chapter on "The Sounds of Language" will not prove easier reading than a "detailed survey of phonetics," which is here avoided as "too technical for the general reader." It is a common error to suppose that an orderly and progressive presentation of the primary technicalities of a subject is not adapted to elementary instruction. An expert phonetician, with experiences that have widened his range of observation, the author has composed a "survey of phonetics" that has many points of general linguistic interest. "Some languages allow of great heapings of consonants or of vocalic groups (diphthongs), in others no two consonants or no two vowels may ever come together"; and from another point of view, the occurrence of an adopted sound may be curiously restricted, as, for example, in English, "the z-sound of *azure* cannot occur initially." As to the psychological values of sounds, the English-speaking person is indifferent to the distinction between the *t* of *time* and the *t* of *sting*, whereas "precisely the same difference of articulation has a

real value" in the Indian language Haida (p. 56). Now, "the purely objective system of sounds that is peculiar to a language," begets the consciousness of an "inner sound-system," which is "an immensely important principle in the life of a language for it is its pattern or ideal." This is not sufficiently recognized by the scientific linguist.

"Form in Language" is discussed and analyzed under the divisions of "Grammatical Processes" and "Grammatical Concepts." The 'processes' are "grouped into six main types; word order; composition; affixation, including the use of prefixes, suffixes, and infixes; internal modification of the radical or grammatical element, whether this affects a vowel or a consonant; reduplication; and accentual differences, whether dynamic (stress) or tonal (pitch)." In the light of the author's wide survey of linguistic phenomena, these topics are handled in a manner that deepens and extends the significance of the science of language.

The closer view "of the world of concepts, in so far as that world is reflected and systematized in linguistic structure" is given in the second chapter on "Form." From the discussion emerges an analysis, drawn up in tabular form, of the concepts expressed in a chosen sentence "and of the grammatical processes employed for their expression." The short sentence of five words —*The farmer kills the duckling*—is shown to express thirteen distinct concepts, of which three are radical and concrete, two derivational, and eight relational." What will further elicit interest is the comment that the analysis makes manifest "the curious lack of accord in our language between function and form." A wider view then leads to a revision of the first tabular scheme. And a discussion that is not divested of a certain degree of quibbling relates to the time-honored classification of words into 'parts of speech.' The classification is declared to be "only a vague, wavering, approximation to a consistently worked out inventory of experience." The philosophy of the 'parts of speech' is something more profound than that.

On what basis can the types of linguistic structure be classified? "Such a purely technical classification of languages as the current one into 'isolating,' 'agglutinative' and 'inflective' (read 'fusional') cannot claim to have great value as an entering wedge into the discovery of the intuitional forms of language. I do not know whether the suggested classification into four conceptual groups is likely to drive deeper or not. My own feeling is that it does." Here is a bold and ingenious grappling with a question of vast complexities (pp. 127-156). This conceptual classification rests on too broad a basis of linguistic phenomena to be satisfactorily verified by the average philologist, and the non-technical mind will be bewildered when it finds that French and Bantu (African) fall into a close relationship.

The author is facile in presenting accepted facts and principles relating to the maintenance of a standard speech, despite the inevitable variations in individual usage, and in discussing the distinctive features of dialectal speech. These topics lead into a discussion of the 'drift' of a language, the gradual movement of a language in a direction favorable to the standardizing of forms previously unauthorized. The point is illustrated by assuming the acceptance as standard English of the forms 'who did you see', 'It is me,' and of some other forms that are not selected with deepest discernment of the 'drift' of the language. During the latter part of the eighteenth century the 'drift' would have been incorrectly declared to establish the form 'you was.' And 'who' in the construction considered reaches back too far to be designated a true 'drift'; 'those sort of things,' for example, also illustrates at once the persistence of an error and the persistence of the stability of the grammatical norm of the language. The 'drift' of English is deeper than the surface dimpled by errors of this class.

The chapters that follow and bring the book to its close (pp. 183-247) are entitled "Language as a Historical Product: Phonetic Law"; "How Languages influence each other"; "Language, Race and Culture"; and "Language and Literature." This section of the book, which cannot now be described in detail, abounds in well expressed and just generalizations. The author establishes his competency to deal with the philosophy of language. To indicate something of what is to be found in these chapters, there is a discussion of "the psychological contrast between English and German as regards the treatment of foreign material," for in this contrast one obtains light on "innate formal tendencies." And notice this, "Language is probably the most self-contained, the most massively resistant of all social phenomena"; and this, "Culture may be defined as *what* a society does and thinks. Language is a particular *how* of thought." Finally, the "formal dependence of literature on language" is treated in the author's best manner and in accordance with the æsthetic tenet that every art is conditioned by the range of qualities and by the restraints of its particular 'material' or medium of expression. One summarizing statement may be cited: "Every language is itself a collective art of expression. There is concealed in it a particular set of esthetic factors—phonetic, rhythmic, symbolic, morphological—which it does not completely share with any other language."

J. W. B.

193

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVII APRIL, 1922 NUMBER 4

CHATEAUBRIAND ET MRS. SUTTON: L'EPILOGUE D'UN ROMAN D'AMOUR

Le roman d'amour qu'ébaucha Chateaubriand pendant son exil en Angleterre avec Charlotte Ives, la fille du pasteur de Bungay, a suscité presque autant de controverses que le fameux voyage en Amérique. Après la publication de l'article de M. E. Dick et le livre de M. Le Braz, on pouvait croire la question définitivement réglée.[1] Dans l'ensemble, et bien que l'on pût encore soulever quelques doutes sur des points de détail, leur enquête très minutieuse avait confirmé le récit donné par Chateaubriand lui-même dans les *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*.[2] On se souvient comment il y raconte qu'il se laissa insensiblement gagner par le charme naïf de la jeune fille, comment il passa sans presque s'en apercevoir de la lecture du Tasse à des sujets plus personnels, et comment il devenait bel et bien amoureux de la charmante Charlotte, quand Mrs. Ives le pria de déclarer ses intentions, en lui laissant entendre qu'elle et son mari verraient d'un œil des plus favorables l' union de leur fille et du jeune émigré. C'est seulement alors que Chateaubriand sembla se souvenir qu'il était marié. Il en fit l'aveu, et sans dire adieu à Charlotte, prit la fuite pour ne jamais revenir à Bungay. Le souvenir de la jeune Anglaise devait cependant le hanter dans les années qui suivirent: sous les traits de Céluta, d'Atala et de Cymodocée on peut retrouver jusqu'à un certain point l'image persistante de celle qui semble bien avoir été le premier véritable amour de Chateaubriand.

[1] E. Dick, Le séjour de Chateaubriand en Suffolk, *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1908, xv, p. 105. A. Le Braz, *Au pays d'exil de Chauteaubriand*, Paris, 1908.

[2] *Mém. d'O.-T.*, éd. Biré, t. II, p. 133-141.

Il nous a dit lui-même comment il devait la revoir, longtemps plus tard, en 1822, alors qu'il était ambassadeur à Londres, et comment Charlotte Ives devenue lady Sutton, ou plus exactement Mrs. Sutton se présenta un jour à lui, accompagnée de ses deux fils.[3] L'authenticité de cette entrevue nous était attestée par M. de Marcellus, mais pour le détail nous ne possédions que le témoignage de Chateaubriand. De Charlotte elle-même il semblait que il ne subsistait rien; M. Dick après s'être livré à des recherches minutieuses à Bungay nous affirme qu'il ne reste pas d'elle "un mot d'écrit."[4] Comme on pouvait s'y attendre, certains des historiens de Chateaubriand n'ont pas manqué de profiter d'une si belle occasion pour l'accuser une fois de plus d'inexactitude et pour faire remarquer combien il était invraisemblable que Charlotte fût allée solliciter la protection de Chateaubriand pour un de ses fils, si vraiment elle avait éprouvé pour lui un sentiment profond et durable dans sa jeunesse. Or pendant tout ce temps, nous possédions dans deux lettres de Mrs. Sutton à Chateaubriand la justification de l'auteur des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe.* Chose plus curieuse, ces deux lettres étaient accessibles à tous puisqu' elles avaient été imprimées dans les *Souvenirs et Correspondance de Madame Récamier.* Il semble cependant qu'elles aient échappé aux critiques. Ni M. Dick, ni M. Le Braz, ni M. Giraud ne paraissent s'en être souvenus, et je suis d'autant plus à l'aise pour signaler cette étrange omission que je peux moi-même faire mon mea culpa. Grâce à cette correspondance, nous sommes maintenant en mesure de vérifier l'exactitude du récit de Chateaubriand et de déterminer par un nouvel exemple le degré d'authenticité qu'il convient d'accorder aux *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe.*

Avant d'en faire l'analyse, reprenons les traits essentiels du passage bien connu où Chateaubriand raconte dans quelles circonstances il revit Charlotte. Il nous raconte comment, alors qu' il était ambassadeur à Londres en 1822, occupé de sa besogne diplomatique et employant ses loisirs à revivre son ancienne idylle, "une dame anglaise" demanda à lui parler. "J'étais dans mon cabinet; on a annoncé lady Sulton; j'ai vu entrer une femme en deuil accompagnée de deux beaux garçons également en deuil: l'un

[3] *Mém. d'O.-T.*, t. II, pp. 142-145.
[4] Article cité, p. 105.

pouvait avoir seize ans et l'autre quatorze. Je me suis avancé vers l'étrangère; elle était si émue qu'elle pouvait à peine marcher. Elle m'a dit d'une voix altérée: "*Mylord, do you remember me?* Me reconnaissez-vous?" Oui, j'ai reconnu Miss Ives! les années qui avaient passé sur sa tête ne lui avaient laissé que leur printemps. . . ." L'émotion les rendit silencieux quelques minutes et quand Chateaubriand put parler, ce fut pour demander: "Et vous, Madame, me reconnaissez-vous?" Elle a levé les yeux qu' elle tenait baissés, et, pour toute réponse, elle m'a adressé un regard souriant et mélancolique comme un long souvenir. Sa main était toujours entre les deux miennes. Charlotte m'a dit: "Je suis en deuil de ma mère; mon père est mort depuis plusieurs années. Voilà mes enfants." . . . Bientôt elle a repris: "Mylord, je vous parle à présent dans la langue que j'essayais avec vous à Bungay. Je suis honteuse: excusez-moi. Mes enfants sont les fils de l'amiral Sutton que j'épousais trois ans après votre départ d'Angleterre." Ce jour-là la conversation n'alla pas plus avant, mais le lendemain et les jours suivants, Chateaubriand devait la revoir seule, chez elle. Après "la série de ces *vous souvient-il* qui font renaître toute une vie," Mrs. Sutton présenta sa requête. "Je suis venue à Londres pour vous prier de vous intéresser aux enfants de l'amiral Sutton: l'aîné désirerait passer à Bombay. M. Canning, nommé gouverneur des Indes, est votre ami; il pourrait emmener mon fils avec lui. Je serais bien reconnaissante, et j'aimerais vous devoir le bonheur de mon premier enfant." A quoi Chateaubriand répondit qu' il irait voir M. Canning, tout en lui reprochant doucement d'employer en lui parlant le titre de *mylord.* Charlotte répliqua: "Je ne vous trouve pas changé, pas même vieilli. Quand je parlais de vous à mes parents pendant votre absence, c'était toujours le titre de *mylord* que je vous donnais; il me semblait que vous le deviez porter; n'étiez-vous pas pour moi comme un mari, *my lord and master,* mon seigneur et maître?" Chateaubriand vit Canning et n'en put tirer que de vagues promesses. Bientôt Charlotte annonça qu' elle allait retourner à Bungay.

"Quand je vous ai connu, me disait-elle, personne ne prononçait votre nom; maintenant qui l'ignore? Savez-vous que je possède un ouvrage et plusieurs lettres écrits de votre main? Les voilà." Elle me remit un

paquet. "Ne vous offensez pas si je ne veux rien garder de vous," et elle se prit à pleurer. "*Farewell! farewell!* me dit-elle, souvenez-vous de mon fils. Je ne vous reverrai jamais, car vous ne viendrez pas me chercher à Bungay."—"J'irai, mécriai-je; j'irai vous porter le brevet de votre fils." Elle secoua la tête d'un air de doute et se retira. Rentré à l'ambassade, je m'enfermai et j'ouvris le paquet. Il ne contenait que des billets de moi insignifiants et un plan d'études, avec des remarques sur les poëtes anglais et italiens." [5]

S'il n'alla pas à Bungay, Chateaubriand devait cependant revoir Mrs. Sutton:

"Elle vint avec une partie de sa famille me voir en France lorsque j'étais ministre en 1823. Par une de ces misères inexplicables de l'homme, préoccupé que j'étais d'une guerre d'où dépendait le sort de la monarchie française, quelque chose sans doute aura manqué à ma voix, puisque Charlotte, retournant en Angleterre, me laissa une lettre dans laquelle elle se montra blessée de la froideur de ma réception. Je n'ai osé ni lui écrire ni lui renvoyer des fragments littéraires qu'elle m'avait rendus et que j'avais promis de lui remettre augmentés. S'il était vrai qu'elle eût une raison véritable de se plaindre, je jetterais au feu ce que j'ai raconté de mon premier séjour outre-mer. Souvent il m'est venu en pensée d'aller éclaircir mes doutes; mais pourrais-je retourner en Angleterre, moi qui suis assez faible pour n'oser visiter le rocher paternel sur lequel j'ai marqué ma tombe." [6]

Il est bien peu de lignes de ce récit qui aient échappé à la critique. M. de Marcellus déjà avait donné le signal en accusant Chateaubriand de galanterie exagérée et avait rectifié ainsi le portrait de Mrs. Sutton: "Elle avait sans doute, comme quelques autres Anglaises à cet âge, de beaux traits et une blancheur remarquable dans sa corpulence; mais ce n'était plus le printemps; l'été passait, et déjà commençait l'automne." [7] M. Dick n'a pas manqué de relever dans l'article que nous avons cité ce qui lui semble une inexactitude grave de Chateaubriand. Sur ce point M. Giraud a répondu comme il convenait.[8]. On peut cependant ajouter que Chateaubriand en avait assez dit pour indiquer qu'il n'avait plus pour Charlotte les yeux de son premier amour. "Je

[5] *Mém. d'O.-T.*, t. II, p. 145.

[6] *Mém. d'O.-T.*, t. IV, p. 282.

[7] *Chateaubriand et son temps*, p. 104.

[8] V. Giraud, Sur le témoignage de Chateaubriand dans les "Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe," *Revue d'histoire littéraire*, XV, 1908, p. 333. Voir aussi la réponse de M. Dick, même titre, XV, 1908, p. 501.

viens de revoir Charlotte, il est vrai, dit-il en conclusion, mais après combien d'années l'ai-je revue? Douce lueur du passé, rose pâle du crépuscule qui borde la nuit, quand le soleil depuis longtemps s'est couché." Tout est dit, pour qui sait lire, et l'on ne peut pourtant pas reprocher à Chateaubriand de n'écrire pas comme M. de Marcellus et de n'avoir pas la brutalité d'expression à laquelle nous ont habitués les romanciers naturalistes.

Le reproche adressé à Chateaubriand d'avoir ajouté une autre inexactitude "indubitalement voulue" et d'avoir tenté de "réparer le tort fait à la mémoire de Mrs. Sutton en l'élevant au rang d'une Lady Sutton" n'est pas plus sérieux.[9] M. Dick a constaté très justement que la leçon erronée de *Sulton* est rectifiée au quatrième volume des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe* (p. 284) dans la phrase suivante: "Mais bientôt l'idée d'aller voir Madame Sutton . . .". Il aurait pu constater qu'en même temps Chateaubriand avait remplacé *Lady* par *Madame*.

Par contre, M. Le Braz a justement signalé qu'il y avait dans le récit de Chateaubriand une erreur manifeste.[10] Il a fait mourir la mère de Charlotte avant le voyage de sa fille à Londres; or Mrs. Ives ne mourut que le 18 septembre et le 8 septembre Chateaubriand avait déjà quitté l'Angleterre. Nous verrons plus tard comment cette erreur peut s'expliquer. Pour le moment, nous nous contentons de signaler le fait.

Enfin la critique la plus sérieuse a été signalée à M. Dick par une habitante de Bungay, Miss Lucy Hartcup qui dans une lettre lui déclare: "J'ai entendu dire que la famille Sutton était très indignée du récit que Chateaubriand a fait dans ses mémoires de ses relations avec leur mère, et que ce récit était absolument inexact. Ainsi, par exemple, Chateaubriand voudrait faire croire que leur entrevue à Londres fut pour lui une surprise: le fait est qu'elle avait été projetée et arrangée d'avance. Il avait d'abord été proposé qu'il irait la voir à Bungay, mais ils finirent par s'accorder pour se rencontrer à Londres. Ma mère m'a dit qu'on avait jugé que c'était une étrange façon d'agir pour Mrs. Sutton que d'aller le voir à Londres."[11] "Ceci donc, ajoute M. Dick, n'est qu'un exemple de l'inexactitude du récit des *Mémoires*. A côté de cette

[9] E. Dick, p. 97.
[10] Le Braz, p. 202-203.
[11] E. Dick, p. 98. J'ai légèrement modifié la traduction de M. Dick.

insigne invention, il ne vaut guère la peine de relever d'autres inexactitudes." Voilà certes une bien chaude indignation qui n'a d'autre fondement que des cancans de petite ville. J'avoue pour ma part que, sans trop croire à l'exactitude scrupuleuse de Chateaubriand, s'il fallait choisir entre sa version et celle de Miss Hartcup, j'hésiterais fort peu. On comprend que par piété filiale les fils de Mrs. Sutton aient protesté au moment de la publication des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*. Il est moins légitime de se prévaloir d'une inexactitude de détail, inexactitude qui d'ailleurs n'est pas certaine, pour mettre en doute la réalité de tout le récit de Chateaubriand. Par bonheur, sur ce point et sur bien d'autres, nous possédons un témoignage irréfutable: c'est Charlotte elle-même qui s'est chargée de justifier Chateaubriand et c'est elle encore qui va nous faire l'aveu de son amour.

Puisque les deux lettres qu'elle a écrites à Chateaubriand ont échappé jusqu'ici aux chercheurs on nous permettra de les reproduire intégralement, en renvoyant aux *Souvenirs et correspondance de Madame Récamier* pour la traduction française.[12]

La première lettre est datée, *17th June 1823;* dans la traduction la date donnée est 7 juin 1822, une erreur évidente, puisque le texte même indique que la lettre fut écrite un an après l'entrevue avec Chateaubriand. La voici:

Ditchingham Lodge, near Bungay, 17th *June* 1823.

Occupied with the fate of empires, and stationed on so lofty an eminence that the petty concerns of humbler life can scarcely be visible, your Excellency cannot easily imagine how much the mind of a private individual may dwell on a single thought until it becomes painful from intensity.

Unwilling to be guilty of intrusion (especially on *you*), yet equally reluctant to appear ungrateful, you perhaps would smile, could you fully know the embarrassment even this letter has occasioned me. But your kind words: "puis-je être bon à quelque chose pour vous?" and the kind tone in which they were attended, have echoed in my heart, until perhaps they have disturbed my head. Twelve long months have now elapsed since I heard them, during which time I have often painfully regretted having very inadequately expressed my deep-felt sense of your kindness; but in truth, it was so blended with other feelings, that I could not dwell on the subject. The hope too, which your Excellency permit [*permitted me?*] to entertain of seeing you here (a hope so pleasing that I overlooked

[12] Nous reproduisons les lettres telles qu'elles sont données dans les *Souvenirs*, t. I, p. 404-413. Il y a quelques erreurs manifestes de copie; nous indiquerons au fur et à mesure les corrections possibles.

the impossibilities of its accomplishment, awakened my maternal vanity to fancy that my sons might win some portion of your approbation for themselves.

When I had last the honor of seeing you, you were proceeding to Gloucester Lodge, with the kind intention of speaking in favor of one of my sons to M. Canning, whose accession to the ministry gives him perhaps as much influence with respect to India now, as his own personal destination thither would have done. Assuredly, my own feelings would not lead me to desire such a banishment for any of my children; but my eldest son, Samuel Ives Sutton, now in his seventeenth year, has expressed so decided and steady a wish for some civil appointment in India, that it is my duty to do all in my power to promote it.

A writer-ship to *Madras*, for next year, is the summit of his ambition. It is not in itself a very great thing, yet so numerous are the competitors, that it is absolutely unattainable, excepting by the hand of power.

This then, Mylord, is the point; *and how much it has cost me to come to it, you can never know.*

With the most earnest wishes for your health and happiness, and every sentiment of the highest consideration and respect, in which admiral Sutton begs to be permitted to join, I have the honor to be Your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,

CHARLOTTE SUTTON.

Dès maintenant, nous voici en mesure de préciser un certain nombre de points. Puisque douze longs mois se sont écoulés depuis le départ de Charlotte de Londres, sa rencontre avec Chateaubriand a dû avoir lieu dans les premiers jours du mois de juin 1822. L'âge du jeune Samuel est exactement indiqué par Chateaubriand, puisqu'au moment où sa mère écrit il était dans sa dix-septième année. C'est d'un poste à Bombay qu'il est question dans les *Mémoires* et d'un poste à Madras dans la lettre de Mrs. Sutton, légère modification qui a pu se produire dans l'intervalle. Le fait que l'entretien eut lieu en français est confirmé par le rappel des mots " Puis-je être bon à quelque chose." Surtout, et c'est là le point le plus important, il est désormais hors de doute que Mrs. Sutton a bien adressé une requête en faveur de son fils à Chateaubriand. Nous verrons tout à l'heure que ce ne sont pas là les seuls renseignements que nous puissions tirer de cette première lettre, surtout si nous en rapprochons le texte de celui de la seconde que nous donnons maintenant.

14th June 1825.

Mylord,

Permit me to assure your Lordship that I am not guilty of the presumption of intending to inflict an annual letter upon you; and sincerely do I regret that my thoughts cannot be open to your view instead of those

lines; as, could you know them, I venture to believe, you would readily forgive what otherwise may appear intrusive. Once, since I left Paris, I have presumed to trouble your Lordship with a few lines, requesting that the manuscript I had so cherished during twenty seven years might be returned to me. But as it has not been your pleasure to comply with this request, I suppose I ought to forbear a repetition of it.

Mylord, I may perhaps not again intrude on you, never perhaps [*shall?*] I see you more on this side of the grave; forgive me then this once, if I avail myself of the opportunity afforded by admiral Sutton, who is going to Paris with the intention of leaving my eldest son there, in order that he may attain some facility in speaking the French language, an acquirement which will perhaps be useful to him whatever may be his future destiny. When I had the honor of seeing you at Paris, I felt the impropriety of tresspassing upon your Lordship's occupied time, and therefore could not venture to explain myself on some points, in which I saw by your glance (which language it is impossible to misunderstand) what your politeness would kindly have concealed.

But, if, in the endeavour to promote the welfare of her child, a mother should say a few words too much, it is, I trust, an error that in some measure pleads its own excuse, particularly in time like the present, when interest is *every thing*, and scarcely any situation in which a young man may struggle through life can be obtained, *even* by *purchase*, unless patronage smooth the way.

But I will not presume further to detain your attention. Let it be permitted me only to say, Mylord, that feelings too keen to be controled rendered the first few minutes I passed under your roof most acutely painful. The events of seven and twenty previous years all rushed to my recollection; from the early period when you crossed my path like a meteor, to leave me in darkness, when you disappeared, to that *inexpressibly* bitter moment, when I stood in your house an uninvited stranger, and in a character as new to myself as perhaps unwelcome to you.

Farewell, Mylord. May you be happy! is the deeply felt, the earnest wish of Your Lordship's devoted and obedient servant,

CHARLOTTE SUTTON.

M. Baldensperger a le premier, je crois attiré, l'attention sur la phrase des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe* où Chateaubriand évoque devant Charlotte, devenue Mrs. Sutton, le souvenir de "vingt-sept années livrées à un autre." Nous sommes en 1822; elle se serait donc mariée en 1795. Mais elle lui dit elle-même qu'elle a épousé l'amiral "trois ans après votre départ d'Angleterre"—donc en 1803, à supposer que la pauvre Charlotte ait été renseignée sur le départ de son *lord and master* imaginaire, ou en 1798 ou 1799 si elle voulait simplement parler du départ de Bungay."[13] Mais

[13] F. Baldensperger, Chateaubriand et l'émigration royaliste à Londres, *Revue d'histoire littéraire*, XIV, 1907, p. 585.

nous connaissons maintenant exactement la date du mariage de Charlotte: c'est le 7 avril 1806 qu'elle épousa l'amiral Sutton, soit plus de dix ans après le départ de Bungay. Le compte n'y est plus du tout. D'où vient donc le chiffre vingt-sept indiqué par Chateaubriand dans ses *Mémoires?* C'est tout simplement le nombre d'années pendant lesquelles Charlotte a gardé le manuscrit auquel elle attachait tant de prix. Ce sont ces vingt-sept années que Mrs. Sutton a dû mentionner en lui remettant le petit paquet qu'il affecte de tant dédaigner, et c'est le chiffre qui lui est revenu à la mémoire au moment où il rédigeait ses souvenirs. Ce sont aussi les vingt-sept années qui séparent le départ de Bungay de l'entrevue de Londres; c'est ce que nous savions déjà de façon à peu près certaine. Il serait dangereux de vouloir préciser davantage. On peut se demander, d'autre part, quel était ce manuscrit que Charlotte réclamait avec tant d'insistance? Chateaubriand se serait-il fait tellement supplier pour le lui rendre s'il n'avait contenu "qu'un plan d'études avec des remarques sur quelques poëtes anglais ou italiens"? Nous connaissons assez notre auteur pour savoir qu'il a dû utiliser quelque part ces notes et qu'elles ont dû paraître dans l'édition des œuvres complètes de 1826, à moins qu'il ne les ait réservées pour son *Essai sur la littérature anglaise.*

Ce qui est plus important et ce qui me semble presque certain, c'est que Chateaubriand a fondu en une scène unique les différentes entrevues qu'il eut avec Charlotte. Souvenons-nous des paroles qu'elle prononce en le quittant à Londres: "*Farewell! farewell,* me dit-elle, souvenez-vous de mon fils. Je ne vous reverrai jamais, car vous ne viendrez jamais me chercher à Bungay." Or, nous savons par la première lettre qu'elle avait emporté de Londres l'espoir de le recevoir chez elle "*the hope of seeing you here.*" C'est au contraire dans la lettre de 1825 qu'elle lui adresse un véritable adieu, un *farewell* définitif et qu'elle exprime la crainte de ne plus le revoir de ce côté de la tombe. Il n'est point téméraire de supposer que Chateaubriand s'il a écrit en 1822 ce chapitre des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe* l'a retouché plus tard, que le souvenir des paroles prononcées par Charlotte s'est fondu avec le souvenir des lettres qu'il avait reçues, que les vingt-sept années de séparation sont alors devenues les "vingt-sept années livrées à un autre" et que l'au-revoir de Londres est devenu le *farewell* qu'elle lui

adressait de Bungay trois ans plus tard. De plus, si l'on s'en rapporte à la note préliminaire des *Souvenirs de Madame Récamier*, il s'est trompé sur la date même de l'entrevue de Paris: "avant de lui écrire cette seconde lettre, lady Sutton avait fait un voyage en France, et nous devons fixer l'époque de ce voyage à l'année 1824, quoique M. de Chateaubriand dans ses *Mémoires* le place en 1823, et pendant son ministère." C'est en effet ce qui ressort du texte même de la seconde lettre, puisque Mrs. Sutton se défend de vouloir lui écrire une lettre tous les ans et qu'elle lui avait déjà écrit pour lui redemander le manuscrit. Là encore la mémoire de Chateaubriand aurait été en défaut et la froideur de l'accueil qu'il fit à la pauvre Charlotte n'aurait pas pour excuse les graves responsabilités qu'il aurait eues alors, s'il avait déjà quitté le ministère au moment du voyage qu'elle fit à Paris. Peut-être d'ailleurs n'aurait-elle pas dit "your house" s'il l'avait reçue au ministère, mais c'est là une simple hypothèse dont on ne doit pas exagérer l'importance. Enfin, si Chateaubriand a vu Mrs. Sutton porter le deuil de sa mère, c'est évidemment à Paris en 1824 et non à Londres en 1822. Cette fois encore, Chateaubriand, inspiré, inconsciemment peut-être, par le sentiment des "convenances" artistiques plus que par un souci scrupuleux de la chronologie, a fondu deux scènes qui, dans la réalité, étaient séparées par un intervalle de plusieurs mois. Nous voyons donc confirmé une fois de plus ce que nous savions déjà par plus d'un exemple: c'est qu'on ne peut accepter les yeux fermés les dates données par Chateaubriand, qu'il arrange et qu'il modifie les événements, ce qui du reste ne veut pas du tout dire qu'il les falsifie de propos délibéré.

Les lettres de Mrs. Sutton en effet, ne laissent plus subsister aucun doute sur l'authenticité du roman d'amour de Bungay et sur les différentes entrevues. Chateaubriand a pu confondre les dates; ce qui compte, c'est qu'il a peint exactement ses sentiments aussi bien que ceux de Charlotte, jusqu'à la froideur dont il s'accuse. Ce qui compte surtout, c'est la révélation des longues et silencieuses souffrances de la pauvre abandonnée, et l'aveu qui jaillit de son cœur après vingt-sept années de séparation.

Le fait même que Charlotte Ives, devenue Mrs Sutton, était allée trouver Chateaubriand à Londres en 1822, pour solliciter son appui en faveur de son fils, a toujours paru difficile à expliquer. Comment peut-on admettre en effet que, si Chateaubriand a été pour elle

autre chose qu'un professeur de français, " elle ait recommandé à sa haute bienveillance les fils de l'homme d'honneur qui l'a consolée de son abandon." [14] Miss Hartcup, citée par M. Dick, nous affirme que toute la petite ville la blâma fort de sa démarche et qu'elle ne partit pour Londres que malgré la résistance de sa famille. Nous pouvions l'en croire sur parole; mais il ressort nettement des deux lettres de Mrs. Sutton que c'est avec l'approbation entière de son mari qu'elle continue à rester en relations avec Chateaubriand. Ne venons-nous pas de voir que l'amiral se joint à sa femme pour envoyer à l'ambassadeur de France à Londres *" every sentiment of the highest consideration and respect?"* Il y a mieux, Mrs. Sutton profite d'un voyage à Paris de son mari pour le charger de remettre à *" mylord"* une lettre où une passion mal éteinte transparaît presque à chaque ligne. Qu'avait-elle avoué au moment de son mariage, ou après son mariage, de son roman d'amour avec le jeune émigré? Il est difficile de croire que l'amiral l'ait entièrement ignoré. J'ai quelque peine à admettre cependant qu'il ait pris connaissance de la lettre qu'il emportait, quel que fût son désir d'obtenir pour son fils la protection d'un aussi puissant personnage que M. de Chateaubriand.

D'autre part, nous ne pouvons plus croire que Mrs. Sutton ait été poussée uniquement par son amour maternel. C'est encore Miss Hartcup qui nous la peint comme *" a lady with dark hair and eyes and great determination of character."* Je suis prêt à reconnaître qu'ayant pris à cœur de faire obtenir à son fils la position qu'il désirait, elle a pu croire elle-même qu'elle n'avait pas d'autre objet en se présentant devant son " lord and master." Elle a lutté contre son légitime ressentiment avant de se décider: " vous ne saurez jamais combien il m'en a coûté pour en arriver là," écrit-elle à celui qu'elle a tant aimé. Elle cherche à maintenir la même fiction maladroite dans sa seconde lettre. Elle se refuse à comprendre l'irritation qu'éprouve Chateaubriand à l'entendre toujours parler de son fils: " votre fils, quoi qu'il m'en coûte de lui donner ce nom, votre fils . . .", répond-il à sa requête. Mais nous sommes certains aujourd'hui que Chateaubriand n'a exagéré ni l'amour naïf que Charlotte éprouva pour lui à Bungay, ni l'émotion et le trouble qui s'emparèrent d'elle quand elle le revit

[14] Le Braz, p. 157.

après ces longues années de séparation. Point n'est besoin de nous demander maintenant avec lui: "Qu'arriva-t-il à Bungay après mon départ? Qu'est devenue cette famille où j'avais apporté la joie et la douleur?" C'est non point trois ans, comme il le dit avec une indifférence superbe, mais près de dix ans que la pauvre Charlotte mit à se guérir de la blessure qu'elle avait reçue et c'est seulement dix ans après, qu'elle se résigna à un mariage de raison avec un honnête homme de marin qui avait presque le double de son âge. Mais ni la vie de famille, ni la naissance de deux enfants, ni les longues années de séparation n'avaient réussi à arracher de son cœur l'image de son chevalier. René vieilli et oublieux qui avait gardé le souvenir de l'amour plus que de la femme a dû hésiter à reconnaître dans Mrs. Sutton épaissie et flanquée de ses deux grands garçons la sylphide de ses rêves et l'inspiratrice de ses poèmes. Charlotte le voyait encore tel qu'il était aux jours de Bungay; pour elle, il n'avait point changé et la voix de l'enchanteur réveilla en elle "la foule des souvenirs de tout ce qui s'était passé depuis vingt-sept années." Que nous reste-t-il à apprendre quand nous relisons cette lettre de Charlotte où les regrets et la douleur finissent par lui arracher ce cri de passion mal contenue: "Qu'il me soit seulement permis de vous dire, milord, combien des sentiments trop vifs pour être maîtrisés me rendirent douloureusement pénibles les premières et courtes minutes que j'ai passées sous votre toit. Les souvenirs d'événements antérieurs de vingt-sept années se pressaient dans ma pensée, depuis le premier instant où semblable à un météore, vous traversâtes mon chemin, pour me laisser dans les ténèbres lorsque vous disparûtes, jusqu'à ce moment d'inexprimable amertume où je me trouvai chez vous, étrangère non conviée, et jouant un rôle aussi inaccoutumé pour moi qu'il était peut-être importun pour vous." Elle pouvait encore l'appeler "my lord and master"; la passion de René l'avait marquée d'une empreinte ineffaçable, et elle lui emprunte jusqu'à son style et cette image qu'il n'aurait pas désavouée. L'amour de la jeune fille de quinze ans venait de refleurir au cœur de la femme de quarante.

Chateaubriand nous apprend lui-même qu'il ne répondit jamais à cette dernière lettre de Charlotte et s'accuse humblement d'une faute qui est toute à son honneur. Qu'aurait-il pu répondre?

[15] *Mém. d'O.-T.*, t. III, p. 58.

Comment reprendre après un tel intervalle le roman de la vingtième année pour lui ajouter un chapitre? Est-il bien certain d'ailleurs qu'il n'ait point répondu? On connaît la fameuse lettre de René à Céluta qui se trouve dans les *Natchez,* publiés seulement en 1826, un an après la dernière lettre de Mrs. Sutton. On sait avec quelle sévérité Chateaubriand l'a jugée dans les *Mémoires:* "S'il y a dans les *Natchez* des choses que je ne hasarderais qu'en tremblant aujourd'hui, il y a aussi des choses que je ne voudrais plus écrire, notamment la lettre de René dans le second volume." Jusqu'ici, j'avais cru avec M. Le Braz que Chateaubriand avait dû reproduire une de ces lettres que, plein de passion et de remords, il écrivait à Charlotte Ives, sans oser les lui envoyer, après sa fuite de Bungay. M. Le Braz admet du reste que la lettre a dû être retravaillée et violemment *renéisée* depuis les jours de Londres. Mais Chateaubriand lui aussi n'avait-il pas senti remonter en lui le flot de la passion d'autrefois quand, après avoir revu Charlotte à Londres, il écrivait dans les *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe,* ces lignes où revit le René des anciens jours: "Si j'avais serré dans mes bras épouse et mère celle qui me fut destinée vierge et épouse, c'eût été avec une sorte de rage, pour flétrir, remplir de douleur et étouffer ces vingt-sept années livrées à un autre, après m'avoir été offertes."[16] Que l'on rapproche de ce passage la lettre de René, non pas la première partie qui est moins frénétique et qui me semble dater des jours de Londres, mais la deuxième partie "Continuée au lever de l'aurore," celle qui commence par ce cri de douleur: "Quelle nuit j'ai passée!" Que l'on relise des phrases comme celles-ci: "Si enfin, Céluta, je dois mourir, vous pourrez chercher après moi l'union d'une âme plus égale que la mienne. Toutefois ne croyez pas désormais recevoir impunément les caresses d'un autre homme; ne croyez pas que de faibles embrassements puissent effacer de votre âme ceux de René. . . . Oui Céluta, si vous me perdez, vous resterez veuve; qui pourrait vous environner de cette flamme que je porte avec moi, même en n'aimant pas? Ces solitudes que je rendais brûlantes vous paraîtraient glacées auprès d'un autre époux. Que chercheriez-vous dans les bois et sous les ombrages? Il n'est plus pour vous d'illusions, d'enivrement, de délire . . . Ne crois pas, Céluta, qu'une femme à laquelle on a fait des aveux aussi cruels, pour laquelle on a formé des souhaits

[16] *Mém. d'O.-T.,* II, p. 145.

aussi odieux que les miens, ne crois pas que cette femme oublie jamais l'homme qui l'aima de cet amour ou de cette haine extraordinaire."

C'est là autre chose qu'une prophétie; c'est la reprise par le grand virtuose du thème ébauché par Mrs. Sutton; c'est la seule réponse que Chateaubriand vieilli pouvait faire à Charlotte vieillie. C'est la lettre qu'il ne pouvait pas et ne voulait pas envoyer, et c'est à Mrs. Sutton, et non à la naïve enfant qu'il avait connue pendant les années d'exil que s'adressaient ce dernier adieu et la prière de " regarder cette lettre comme un testament."

GILBERT CHINARD.

Johns Hopkins University.

CUEVA'S *COMEDIA DEL INFAMADOR* AND THE DON JUAN LEGEND

In his notice on Juan de la Cueva's *Comedia del Infamador* (1581) Moratín wrote: " Leucino es una especie de D. Juan Tenorio." [1] The recent editor of Cueva, Mr. de Icaza, comments on this as follows: " De una frase aislada de Moratín, a la que cierto vulgarizador mal informado dió una interpretación y alcance que no tenía, salió la arbitraria conseja de que el Leucino del *Difamador* (*sic*) es el modelo primitivo del *Burlador de Sevilla* y del *Don Juan Tenorio.* Años ha que esta infundada invención se viene repitiendo, y amenaza perpetuarse como verdad reconocida; pero es lo cierto que no hay en el *Difamador* un solo rasgo que le asemeja al Don Juan en ninguna de sus formas tradicionales";[2] and a little further: " Leucino es un *Difamador;* y nada más que un difamador. Es un rico necio y fanfarrón. . . . Nada logra si no es el castigo de sus intentos, y no es *Burlador,* sino burlado. Por tanto, lo menos donjuanesco posible." The " vulgarizador " whom Mr. de Icaza had in mind was probably Alberto Lista,[3] whose work was later utilized by von Schack [4] and others. There is no need

[1] *Orígenes,* in Ochoa's *Tesoro del teatro español,* I, 116.

[2] Juan de la Cueva, *Comedias y tragedias,* ed. Fr. de Icaza, Madrid, 1917, I, xlviii, xlix.

[3] Alberto Lista, *Lecciones de literatura española,* Madrid, 1836.

[4] " Die Komödie *El Infamador* ist weniger um ihrer selbst willen bemer-

of quoting every subsequent history of Spanish literature. Be it sufficient to point out that in the latest edition of Fitzmaurice-Kelly's *Historia de la literatura española* we find the statement: "*El Infamador* . . . nos da, en el licencioso Leucino, el primer bosquejo del tipo que llegará a ser inmortal con el nombre de Don Juan." [5]

Now, has Moratín been misunderstood, and have his successors perpetuated as ridiculous a mistake, as would appear from Mr. de Icaza's vigorous denunciation? The point seems worth examining in some detail.

The authors of the most recent studies on the Don Juan legend do not seem to have been troubled by doubts. Farinelli [6] declares that "L'Infamador è un Don Giovanni abbominabile, esecrabile, senza nessuna qualità che affascini e soggioghi." D. Víctor Said Armesto [7] unhesitatingly accepts Leucino as the first representative on the Spanish stage of "el carácter del mozo disoluto, del hombre arrestado, procaz y libertino, diestro en requebrar y perseguir mujeres," and whose lineage includes Tirso's *Enrico* and *Don Jorge,* Mescua's *Don Pedro* and *Don Gil,* Lope's *Octavio* and *Leónido,* Cervantes' *Lugo,* and others. M. Gendarme de Bévotte [8] does not attempt to exclude Leucino, "ce fils de famille aux appétits violents, sans cesse en révolte contre l'autorité, la religion et la morale" (p. 30), from the group of characters just mentioned. Th. Schröder [9] gives a summary of Cueva's *El Infamador* and seems satisfied with Gendarme de Bévotte's description of him, adding only that in the *Infamador* the irate father of the hero already appears. It seems, however, that all this accumulation of studies, with or without summaries, of Cueva's play, still leaves room for a closer

kenswert, als insofern ihr Held, Leucino, allem Anschein nach dem Tirso de Molina zum Vorbild seines berühmten *El Burlador de Sevilla* gedient hat." *Gesch. d. dram. Lit. u. Kunst in Spanien,* Berlin, 1845-46, I, 283.

[5] Tercera edición, Madrid, 1921, p. 175.

[6] *Don Giovanni, note critiche,* in *Giorn. stor. della lett. ital.,* XXVII (1896), 33.

[7] *La leyenda de Don Juan,* Madrid, 1908, pp. 92-93.

[8] *La Légende de Don Juan,* Paris, 1906.

[9] *Die dramatischen Bearbeitungen der Don Juan-Sage in Spanien, Italien und Frankreich bis auf Molière einschliesslich,* Halle, 1912 (*Beihefte z. Zschr. f. rom. Phil.,* XXXVI), pp. 68 ff.; also p. 92.

examination of the *Infamador*. A few direct quotations from the text will no doubt be found helpful.

The *Comedia del Infamador* opens with a vigorous assertion by Leucino of the supreme power of wealth:

> No me pone en cuydado
> Ninguna cosa humana,
> Porque a medida del desseo me viene;

His life gives proof of it:

> Y para prueva desta quiero darte
> Por exemplo el discurso de mi vida:
> Dexo la estimacion que en toda parte
> A mi persona a sido concedida,
> Los tropheos de amor quiero acordarte,
> Pues sabes que no ay dama que rendida
> No trayga a mi querer por mi dinero,
> Y no por ser ilustre cavallero.

His page Tercilo, however, reminds him of the humiliating fact that at least one woman has resisted him: Eliodora. The play will show how Leucino, after having failed to force her by violence, determines to destroy her by an infamous accusation. Leucino is wealthy, boastful, and unscrupulous; but what makes him a striking figure on the sixteenth-century stage is his single-minded determination: until he breaks down and weeps for pity he pursues an even, ruthless course, without hesitation or wavering or regret. The warning of the goddess Nemesis at the end of Act I has no effect on him, and when finally Diana herself intervenes, he confesses, simply and completely:

> DIANA. ¿Fuete della ocasion alguna dada?
> LEUCENIO. No, sino viendo no poder vengarme
> A mi querer, determiné vengarme
> Con disfamalla, pues huia de amarme.

It is clear, however, that Leucino's driving motive is not sexual domination, but the vindication of the power of wealth, and in this he is certainly different from Don Juan. Yet, in another way, he comes fairly close to him, for in the group of dramatic characters on the Spanish stage that may be singled out for strength and ruthless purpose his place is with Tenorio. Neither can it be denied that he was a seducer, though not a betrayer of women, but not primarily, and then his argument with them was gold.

However, there may be a further reason, until now apparently overlooked, for what Mr. de Icaza seems to have all too sharply exposed as a perpetuated mistake. There are in the play, even though not in the character of Leucino, certain traits which announce even more definitely the *Burlador*. The *Comedia del Infamador* has no divisions into scenes. In the fourth (and last) act, suddenly and without any warning in the text or in the typographical arrangement, we are transported from the jail where the poisoned food sent to Eliodora by her father [9a] has just miraculously turned into flowers, to the Court of Justice, where a judge is answering an appeal from a certain Peloro on behalf of a prisoner called Reycenio. Neither of these has appeared in the play before, nor have they any essential connection with it. The judge refuses to free Reycenio, because he considers his misdeeds unforgivable:

Y porque no entendays qu'es passion mia
O rancor que le tengo, estad atento,
Oyreys que se le prueva en solo vn dia
Despues que se cumplio mi mandamiento.
Vna muger le pide, a quien servia
Con promessas, que en firme casamiento
Seria su marido, y del gozada
Con otra se casó y *dexó burlada*.[10]
Otra presenta del vna querella,
Diziendo que vna hija infamó suya;
El se desdize, aviendo dicho della
Cosas qué es justa ley que lo destruya.
No ay casada, biuda ni donzella,
Ni ay deuda suya contra quien no arguya
Y ofenda con su lengua, y demas desto
Con su cuñada cometió vn incesto,
Esto ay de Reycenio, y mas que callo
Deste que al mundo con su lengua infama;
Mirad vos si es justicia perdonallo
O si será arrojallo en viva llama.

Peloro is convinced and leaves the court, while the judge prepares to go to the prison.

In the scene quoted above we undoubtedly find a foreshadowing

[9a] Prompted by his sense of honor (see Act II). He is the first character, on the Spanish stage, after Torres Naharro's *Himenea*, animated by the Calderonian *pundonor*.

[10] Our italics.

of the *Burlador de Sevilla,* combined with certain traits of the *Infamador.* It seems quite possible that the infrequent and probably hasty reader or readers of the exceedingly dull plays of Juan de la Cueva may have failed to notice that this was a separate and adventitious scene,[11] and that the *Burlador* and *Infamador* Reycenio, whom the judge here describes, is distinct from the *Infamador* Leucino. It must be confessed that M. Gendarme de Bévotte is mistaken when he declares that Leucino is "un *galán* sans scrupule, qui passe de conquête en conquête, trompe les femmes, leur prodigue serments et promesses de mariage," or that "il a trompé par de fausses promesses et déshonoré nombre de femmes." That is not Leucino, but Reycenio.[12] And it seems that Mr. Schröder, who prints a summary by acts of *El Infamador,* should have noticed this.

Under those conditions it may not be impertinent to attempt a somewhat more specific statement of the relation between Cueva's play and the traditional Don Juan. The essential traits of Don Juan's character as crystallized in the *Burlador* have been described as "perverse sensuality and arrogant blasphemy."[13] Leucino is undoubtedly sensual, but sensuality is not his dominating passion, nor is he shown to be perverse. Reycenio, however, completes Leucino, adding the touch of a habitual deceiver, a *burlador,* of women and the element of perversity (incest). As to arrogant blasphemy, Leucino may well be described as arrogant, and his defiance of all law and decency comes very close to being impious. His failure to be impressed by his father's attitude, and even by Nemesis (whom his *rufián cobarde,* Farandón, actually defies), the necessity of Diana's intervention to bring about his fall would

[11] Before Mr. de Icaza's edition the only reprint was Ochoa's (*Tesoro,* I, Paris, 1838). Of the 1588 edition only two copies are known, while of the first edition (1583) an apparently unique copy was only recently discovered by Professor Schevill. In Ochoa's edition the list of characters at the beginning of the play, and also the partial list for Act IV, mention Peloro, but not Reycenio. Neither the argument of the play nor that of Act IV refers to the scene between Peloro and the judge.

[12] M. Ed. Barry, in his school-edition of Tirso's *Burlador de Sevilla* (Paris, Garnier, 1910), p. 35, justly remarks: ". . . *l'Infamador* ne doit ses bonnes fortunes qu'à la puissance de l'or." But he has not noticed Reycenio.

[13] *Don Juan,* art. by Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *Enc. Brit.,* 11th ed., VIII, 416.

confirm this impression. Both the characters of Leucino and Reycenio, however, are tainted with infamous vindictiveness, a trait which is notably absent from the traditional Don Juan, but which undoubtedly was foremost in the mind of Juan de la Cueva.

Thus, on the whole, Moratín was not quite wrong, and subsequent historians of the Spanish stage have neither misread him nor repeated in turn a manifest mistake. But Moratín's statement was regrettably vague, and may altogether rest on a careless reading of the play. Yet, on the other hand, Mr. de Icaza's irritation is easily understood, although he is much too sweeping in his correction. It is certain, however, that the successors of Moratín should modify their statements, placing the emphasis not on Leucino, but on the whole play.

It is not quite exact to say that Leucino is a model of Don Juan; yet, in a very real sense, he may be called a forerunner. In my opinion, M. Gendarme de Bévotte goes much farther than the facts warrant in stating that "c'est l'*Infamador* de Cueva qui semble lui (*i. e.,* Tirso, whom G. de B. considers as the author of the *Burlador*) avoir fourni l'idée première, la conception générale de la pièce, la leçon qui s'en dégage, la progression de l'émotion religieuse, l'annonce de l'attente anxieuse du châtiment, ainsi que les traits les plus significatifs du caractère de Don Juan: l'amour du plaisir, l'esprit d'indépendance, l'obstination à persévérer dans le mal, le dédain des conseils et des avertissements, même célestes" (p. 57). It is inexact to say that "à l'exception de l' *Infamador,* de Cueva, il n'est pas de pièce qui représente un pécheur damné en dépit de son repentir" (p. 72), because there is nothing to prove that Leucino's appeal for mercy implies any repentance. And it seems more risky still to see in this "une des raisons qui, tout en prouvant les rapports du drame de Cueva avec le *Burlador,* permettent d'attribuer celui-ci à Tirso de Molina" (p. 72).

Leucino is an important figure in the history of the Spanish stage, the first of a remarkable line of essentially rebellious characters. It is well known that the combination of this kind of character with certain international legends centered around an invitation to dinner to a dead man, produced first in the *Burlador de Sevilla* the traditional Don Juan figure of literature. In a general sense, then, Leucino has contributed materially to the formation of the Don Juan type. More strictly speaking, however,

Leucino should be at most considered as a forerunner. There is no evidence whatever of a causal connection between him and the *Burlador*. However, when the play of Cueva is considered *as a whole*, it may be stated with full justification that the *Comedia del Infamador* contains an important preliminary sketch of the now traditional *Don Juan*, a sketch which the author of the *Burlador* may have known or not.

Neither should the term sketch be taken to imply too much. It would be idle to claim that the play presents anything like a distinct outline of the later *Burlador*. That would be too much to expect from Cueva, who is natural and effective only by accident, and whose very success in endowing certain characters with a kind of remorseless determination, seems to be only a result of his native awkwardness.[14]

JOSEPH E. GILLET.

University of Minnesota.

GEORGES DE SCUDÉRY'S LOST EPIC[1]

Goujet (*Bibl. Fr.* XVII, 158) mentions that Georges de Scudéry announced and, probably, wrote an epic of which no manuscript or printed copy is known. Toinet[2] pays but little attention to this lost work; Batereau[3] merely refers to it, while R. Reumann, in his thesis especially devoted to *De Scudéry als Epiker* (1912), neglects it altogether. If the manuscript of this lost epic still exists, the identification of its subject may help toward its discovery; if it is destroyed, or even if de Scudéry never wrote the poem, some light may be thrown on his literary activities and on his relations with Richelieu.

All that is known about this lost epic is derived from a poem

[14] It may be interesting to note that the name Tenorio is sworn by as early as 1574 (*Por vida de Tenorio!*) in González de Eslava's *Coloquios espirituales y sacramentales, Coloquio tercero*, México, 1610; reprinted by Joaquín García Icazbalceta, México, 1877.

[1] I am indebted to Prof. G. L. van Roosbroeck for suggesting the subject of this note.

[2] *Quelques Recherches autour des Poèmes Héroïques-Epiques du Dix-Septième Siècle*, 1899 and 1907, I, p. 161-2 and II, p. 145.

[3] *Georges de Scudéry als Dramatiker*, 1902.

Discours de la France à Monseigneur le Cardinal Duc de Richelieu, après son retour de Nancy—forty pages of redundant flattery—which first appeared in the Anthology published by Boisrobert, the well-known *Sacrifice des Muses* (1635, p. 102 sq.) and was reprinted among de Scudéry's *Autres Œuvres* following his *La Mort de César* (1636). The text makes it clear that the hero of de Scudéry's epic was a Robert Le Grand, and that he belonged to Richelieu's ancestry:

> . . . Elle (i. e. Calliope) se promet, tant elle a de courage,
> De faire voir le bout de ce pénible ouvrage,
> Que le Divin Ronsard n'osa que commencer,
> Et pour ta seule gloire elle veut y penser.
> Apprends que chaque jour cette Muse s'applique
> A former le projet d'un *Poème héroïque,*
> Sur les Maîtres de l'Art, qui n'aura rien des leurs.
> Elle ébauche un dessein, apprête des couleurs;
> Choisit dedans l'Histoire un *Héros de ta race,*
> S'instruit de sa valeur et le suit à la trace;
> Le tire du Sépulchre, afin que dans ses Vers
> Il ne puisse finir qu'avecque l'Univers.
> *Le Sang Royal de Dreux,* d'où vient ton origine,
> Lui fournit à présent tout ce qu'elle imagine;
> Et c'est *Robert le Grand* qu'elle veut élever,
> Jusqu'où mortel que toi ne sçaurait arriver.

Toinet[4] identifies this Robert *le Grand* with a Robert *le Fort,* who lived in the ninth century: "Robert le Fort était bien (as he already stated in *op. cit.,* I, pp. 161-2) le héros du poème que Scudéry rêvait d'écrire pour suppléer à la Franciade de Ronsard inachevée, mais cette épopée devait être intitulée Robert le Grand; il le dit expressément." Unfortunately this identification disagrees with de Scudéry's statements, for he declares that his hero belongs to "*le Sang Royal de Dreux*" and that his name is Robert *le Grand.* Nowhere does he mention a Robert *le Fort.* Moreover, Robert le Fort did not belong to the Maison de Dreux, and, although a fierce warrior, he is nowhere designated as le Grand.[5] On the other hand, there existed a Count of Dreux, called Robert le Grand, a great warrior too, of royal blood, an ancestor of Richelieu, whose name and qualities correspond exactly to the description given by de

[4] *Op. cit.,* II, p. 145.

[5] He was entrusted by the King, Charles the Bald, with the government of the Duché, that is the territory between the Seine and the Loire.

Scudéry in his *Discours de la France.* It is Robert de France, called le Grand, fifth son of King Louis VI. In 1147 he took part in the Crusades and in 1158 served his brother, Louis le Jeune, against the English. He received the County of Dreux as an apanage around 1135. He founded the House of Dreux from which Richelieu claimed to descend. Georges de Scudéry, no doubt, gathered his information from André Du Chesne's *Histoire Généalogique des maisons de Dreux, Bar le Duc . . . Le Plessis, Richelieu, Broye et Château Vilain; avec les preuves,* which appeared in 1632, three years before de Scudéry's poem.[6] Aubéry, in his *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu,* 1660, borrows his genealogical information from Du Chesne and traces Richelieu's genealogy as follows:

"Et François du Plessis III, du nom Seigneur de Richelieu, . . . , épousa pareillement Anne Le Roy, qui portait d'argent à la bande de gueules écartelé de Dreux, qui est déchiqueté d'or et d'azur à la bordure de gueules; d'autant qu'en qualité de petite-fille de deux princesses du Sang Royal de France, qui étaient Jeanne de Dreux la bisayeule et Aliénor de Dreux, sœur de Pierre de Dreux, dit Mauclerc, duc de Bretagne, elle aurait l'honneur *de descendre en ligne directe de Robert de France, fils du Roy Louis le Gros,* et d'Alix de Savoye, *qui eut le Comté de Dreux pour apanage.*" Richelieu's descendance from the Counts of Dreux was through women. A little further, Aubéry also speaks of Louis du Plessis I du nom, Seigneur de Richelieu, . . . , who, "ayant dessein de soutenir ces hautes alliances, épousa Françoise de Rochechouart qui descendait aussi par femmes de Béatrix de Dreux, dame de Mathefelon, princesse du Sang Royal de France, et de Jeanne de Dreux, d'Alix de Dreux, autres princesses de la mesme Maison Royale." From all this it results that the hero of de Scudéry's unpublished epic was not Robert le Fort, living in the ninth century, but Robert le Grand, of the twelfth, Richelieu's

[6] Cf. Moréri, *Dict. Hist.—Article Dreux; Succession Généalogique et Chronologique des Comtes de Dreux, sortis de la Maison Royale.* Niceron, *Mémoires,* VII, p. 331, says: "On a reproché à Duchesne d'avoir composé la généalogie de Du Plessis-Richelieu, pour faire descendre de Louis le Gros par les femmes le Cardinal de ce nom; mais le Laboureur dans ses additions aux Mémoires de Castelnau, l'a fort bien justifié là-dessus. On peut même dire qu'il a fait la généalogie des principales maisons de France sans donner atteinte à la vérité."

ancestor. The promise of this poem was, no doubt, no mean way of flattering the powerful Cardinal. It shows that, already in 1635, de Scudéry was anxiously striving to capture his favor, and these attempts are in perfect accordance with his conduct in the Cid-quarrel, not fully two years later.

ANTONY CONSTANS.

University of Minnesota.

GERMANISCHE WORTDEUTUNGEN

1. Gotisch *inn, inna.*

Neben der Präposition *in,* der bekanntlich griech. *ἐν* (oder *ἐνί*) und lat. *in* (aus älterem *en*) entspricht, liegen in allen älteren germanischen Sprachen zugehörige Bildungen mit doppeltem Nasal, vor allem die drei Adverbien:

(1) got. *inn* ('ein, hinein')= anord. *inn,* ahd., asächs., ags. *in(n)*. Während im Gotischen *in* un *inn* im wesentlichen noch scharf getrennt bleiben, tritt im Westgerm. überall mehr oder weniger Mischung ein. Vgl. z. B. das Schwanken der Heliand-Hss. zwischen *inn-* und *in-* (Gallée, *Asächs. Gram.*² § 148, 12); ahd. *inouon* (Dat. pl. von *inouua* 'Wohnort,' Otfr. III, 14, 75) neben *innouno* (Gen. pl., Otfr. IV, 4, 70); ags. *in(n)-orf* 'household goods,' *in(n)-ylfe* 'intestines.' Ein Verweis auf die eingehende Darstellung derartiger Berührungen bei J. Grimm, *Gramm.* II, 758-761 ist auch heute noch am Platze.

(2) got. *inna* 'innen, innerhalb' = anord, *inni,* ags. *inne,* as. ahd. *inna.*

(3) got. *innana* 'von innen, in das Innere' = anord. u. westgerm. (ags. as. ahd.) *innan* 'innen, innerhalb,' (*innana* : *inna* = *ûtana* 'von aussen, aussen, ausserhalb': *ûta* ausserhalb, draussen' u. a.)

Dazu kommt dann weiter im Gotischen der anscheinend altertümliche Komparativ *innuma* 'der innere,' das Adverb *innaþro* 'von innen'; im Westgermanischen das Adj. *innar* 'inner,' die Steigerungsformen *innaror, innarost* usw.

Woher kommt der doppelte Nasal dieser Formen? Falk u. Torp im 'Wortschatz der German. Spracheinheit' (Ficks *Vgl. Wtb.* III, 1909) S. 25 erklären das Adv. *inn* 'hinein' als "*en* +

eine mit *n-* anfangende Partikel." Das klingt ganz plausibel. Aber Spuren einer derartigen an Präpositionen antretenden Partikel scheinen anderweitig nicht zu existieren. Dagegen ergibt sich eine Anknüpfung an die verwandten Sprachen und eine in jeder Hinsicht befriedigende Erklärung der fraglichen Formen, wenn man berücksichtigt, dass die Lautgruppe *-nn-* zwischen Vokalen in verschiedenen Sprachen und zu den verschiedensten Zeiten aus *-nd-* entsteht. So liegt im Oskischen und Umbrischen lat. *-nd-* als *-nn-* vor, z. B. osk. *úpsannam* = lat. *operandam,* umbr. *pihaner* = lat. *piandi.* Vgl. Corssen, *Ausspr.*² I, 210 u. v. Planta, *Gramm. der osk.-umbr. Dialekte* I (Strassburg, 1892) S. 417 f., wo man weitere Nachweise findet.—Besonderes Gewicht ist auf die weite Verbreitung der Assimilation des *-nd-* zu *-nn-* in den keltischen Sprachen zu legen. Denn letztere teilen mit dem Germanischen eine Reihe eigentümlicher alter Lautübergänge, z. B. den Wandel des *kt* zu *cht* (d. i. ɧ*t*) in Fällen wie ir. *in-nocht* 'hac nocte,' got. *nahts.* Wir werden auf die Lautgruppen *-nn-* und *-nd-* im Keltischen weiterhin (in No. 4) zurückkommen müssen. Einstweilen mag es genügen, auf Thurneysen, *Altir. Gramm.* (Heidelberg, 1909) § 148ᵇ und Holger Pedersen, *Vergl. Grąmm. der kelt. Sprachen* I (Gött. 1909) S. 114 f. zu verweisen. Beide nehmen an, *nd* sei im älteren Altirischen (z. B. in den Würzburger Glossen) im wesentlichen noch erhalten, während es im jüngeren Altirischen (z. B. schon in den Mailänder Glossen) anfange, sich in *nn* zu wandeln.—Schliesslich sei bemerkt, dass im nördlichen Gebiete des heutigen Niederdeutschen jedes hochd. *nd,* dem ursprünglich ein Vokal folgte, in *nn* umgewandelt erscheint. Da diesem Gebiete sowohl Klaus Groth wie Fritz Reuter und weiterhin die Hauptmasse der neuniederdeutschen Literatur angehört, kann man sich leicht von der Tatsache überzeugen. Beispiele: *ſün'n* 'Sünde,' *de hen'n* 'die Hände,' *fin'n* 'finden,' *bun'n* 'gebunden.' Man vgl. Müllenhoff's Einleitung zum Glossar zu Groths *Quickborn* § 16 (= S. 268 der 3. Ausg. des *Quickborn*) und Nerger, *Gramm. des meklenburg. Dial.* Lpz., 1869) S. 148 f.

Einen Lautwandel, der in den altitalischen Dialekten wie im heutigen Niederdeutschen begegnet und in phonetischer Hinsicht zu den einfachsten Formen der konsonantischen Assimilation zählt, wird man auch einer vorhistorischen Epoche des Germanischen zutrauen dürfen. Dann ist klar, dass got. *inn* identisch ist

mit dem homerischen Adverb ἔνδον 'innen, drinnen; daheim, zu Hause.' Offenbar liegt der adverbial verwendete Akkusativ (sei es m. oder ntr.) eines zu ἐν gehörigen Adjektivs *ἔνδο-ς vor, auf welches bei Homer auch die Adverbia ἔνδοθι und ἔνδοθεν zurückgehen. Zur Bestätigung der vom Griechischen aus gewonnenen Einsicht dient das Altlateinische, wo das Adverb *endo* vielfach (in den Überresten des Zwölftafelgesetzes, bei Ennius, Plautus, Lucrez usw.) bezeugt ist. (Näheres z. B. bei Georges, *Lexikon der lat. Wortformen,* Lpz., 1900, s. v. *in;* Neue, *Formenlehre* II³, p. 907 f.). Diesem *endo* (urspr. natürlich wie ἔξω, mit langem Vokal im Auslaut) kann das got. *inna* genau entsprechen. Aber als völlig sicher wird die Gleichsetzung nicht gelten dürfen. Denn ausl. *-a* im Germanischen ist seiner Herkunft nach vieldeutig; es kann auf idg. *-ā, -ō, -ān, -ōn, -āt, -ōt, -ai, -oi* zurückgehen. Daher kann *inna* auch der bei Theokrit überlieferten und durch griechische Grammatiker bezeugten Form ἔνδοι (Ahrens, *Gr. Linguae Diall.* II 365 f.) entsprechen. Zwischen den beiden Möglichkeiten eine Entscheidung zu versuchen ist unnötig, zumal beide neben einander bestehen können. Wer sich auf eine Herkunftsquelle beschränken möchte, kann nach Belieben wählen.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

Johns Hopkins University.

THOMAS HEYWOOD AS A CRITIC

The early Elizabethans wrote, if not without a critical theory, certainly without any explicit statement of it: theory and practice were things separate. It was only later that criticism affected the new literature deeply or that the poets themselves formulated and expressed their individual tenets. Thomas Heywood, a scholar and a popular dramatist, is an interesting representative of the more conscious artists but, at the same time, one profoundly influenced by the hack-work he was compelled to undertake and by the conditions of the time.

It would be possible to extract from his plays and prose compilations another *Apologie for Poetrie* with formal disquisitions on the dignity and antiquity of the poet's calling. In the Γυναικεῖον, we can hear again, a little less clear and confident, the

voice of Sidney, justifying the ways of Plato to poets. It is hardly to be expected that Heywood should recommend literature to us as Walter Pater could: it was still to him, as for his age, a teacher of morals, eloquence and patriotism. In his *Apology for Actors* his central argument for the stage is purely utilitarian and moral: Melpomene thus lectures him:—

> Am I Melpomene, the buskined Muse,
> That held in awe the tyrants of the world, . . .
> Have I not whipt Vice with a scourge of steele,
> Unmaskt sterne Murder, sham'd lascivious Lust,
> Pluckt off the visar from grimme Treason's face,
> And made the sunne point at their ugly sinnes? . . .
> I have showed Pryde his picture on a stage,
> Layde ope the ugly shapes his steele-glasse hid,
> And made him passe thence meekely.

If in his dramatic journalism, Heywood often offended against the neo-classic code, he subscribed heartily to the letter of its most famous statute, *Omne tulit punctum,* in his capacity as critic.

We do not know what "kinde of necessity enjoyned" him to reopen the discussion of the morality of the drama, after ten or twelve years of peace. Whatever the circumstances were, in 1612 appeared the *Apology for Actors,* one of the most pretentious documents in the quarrel. It starts after the manner of his other prose works from the egg, bestowing a preliminary kick on "the many seditious sectists" who had provoked him to write. He derives the stage "from more than two thousand yeeres agoe," during which time no voice was raised against it: neither Christ nor any of His apostles so much as referred to it, far less censured it:—

> But now's the iron age, and black-mouth'd curres
> Barke at the vertues of the former world.

All this is very Sidneyan and orthodox. But Heywood does not draw his examples merely from the classics; his own age, too, has commendable dramas. "In the time of my residence in Cambridge," he says, "I have seen tragedyes, comedyes, historyes, pastorals and shewes, publickly acted": and it was the participation in these which, he declares, "not onely emboldens a scholer to speake, but instructs him to speake well. . . . It instructs him to fit his phrases to his action, and his action to his phrase, and

his pronuntiation to them both." Jonson and others might be found to praise the pseudo-classical comedies and Senecan tragedies of the day, but only Heywood ventured to regard as literature the chronicle histories, the most popular teachers of patriotism and history: "what man have you now . . . , that cannot discourse of any notable thing recorded even from William the Conqueror, nay from the landing of Brute, untill this day." And Sidney could not have foreseen that the English tongue, hitherto "the most harsh, uneven, and broken language of the world," would, by means of the drama which promised nothing in his days, grow "to a most perfect and composed language," so that "many nations grow inamored of our tongue (before despised)."

Our author was one of the modestest of men and was under no delusion as to the merits of his dramatic or poetic work. On occasion, it is true, he displays an amiable complacency at his own success, at the fact, for instance, that *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody,*

> Grac'd and frequented for the cradle age,
> Did throng the seats, the boxes, and the stage.

He was proud, too, of his two hundred and twenty plays, in which he had "either an entire hand or at the least, a maine finger." But he never makes extravagant claims for his work as literature: he is content if the reader find

> Some mirth, some matter, and, perhaps, some wit.

Not without a sly glance at Ben Jonson, he explains that "my Playes are not exposed unto the world in Volumes, to bear the title of *Workes,* (as others)." He had no irrefragable ideal which neither time nor the change of fashions could alter. Though he had

> Reasons, both just and pregnant, to maintaine
> Antiquity, and those, too, not al vaine,

yet of all the dramatists he was the most compliant with changing tastes. In words which apply better to himself than to any of his contemporaries, he says of the dramatic plenitude of the time,

> To give content to this most curious Age,
> The gods themselves we'have brought down to the Stage
> And figured them in Planets; made even Hell
> Deliver up the Furies, by no spell,

(Saving the *Muses* rapture): further, we
Have traffikt by their helpe; no History
We have left unrifled, our Pens have been dipt
As well in opening each hid Manuscript,
As Tracts more vulgar, whether read, or sung
In our domesticke, or more forraigne tongue:
Of Fairy Elves, Nymphs of the Sea, and Land;
The Lawns and Groves, no number can be scan'd
Which we'have not given feet to, nay 'tis knowne
That when our Chronicles have barren growne
Of Story, we have all Invention stretcht,
Div'd low as to the Center, and then reacht
Unto the *Primum Mobile* above:
(Nor scapt things intermediate).

He himself had tried chronicle history in its day, domestic tragedy, mythology, classical history, humours, intrigue comedy, heroic and romantic drama, pageants and masques, but without any valuation of changing fashions. In the *Epilogue to the Reader* of *A Royal King and Loyal Subject* he asks:—

And what's now out of date, who is't can tell,
But it may come in fashion and sute well?
With rigour, therefore, judge not, but with reason,
Since what you read was fitted to that season.

He was willing to trim his sails to any wind with only one protest—that in *Loves Maistresse,* which was written for the court, against Midas, the personification of ignorance. And only once did he pretend to ignore the contemporary style with its drums, trumpets, dance, masque, &c., "to bumbaste out a Play," when, in the prologue to *The English Traveller,* he declines such help as these can give. But, as a rule, he conforms without demur to the taste of his city friends and puts himself at once, in his prologue, *en rapport* with his audience.

Yet Heywood has his literary ideal: "A Poet cannot be excellent unlesse he be a good Rhetorician, nor any Rhetorician attaine to the height of eloquence, unlesse he has first layd his foundation in Poetrie," he says in Γυναικεῖον. Or again in the *Apology for Actors* we find him discoursing on the essential differences between tragedy and comedy: "They differ thus: in comedies *turbulenta prima, tranquilla ultima;* in tragedyes, *tranquilla prima, turbulenta ultima:*" he proceeds, "Of comedies there be three kindes—moving comedies, called *motoriæ,* standing comedies, called *sta-*

tariæ, or mixt betwixt both, called *mistæ;* they are distributed into foure parts, the *prologue* . . . ; the *protasis* . . . ; the *epitasis* . . . ; the last the catastrophe and conclusion." These are typical examples of his opinions as an avowed classicist. But his own work was written according to different and less exacting theories. "No such is held to be a good poet," he says in Γυναικεῖον, "who doth not wittily and worthily support his Scœnes with applause even to the last catastrophe": and we see from his own statement and practice that dumb-shows, sub-plots, clowns, patriotic appeals and the rest of the stock of the journalist-playwright, were the means by which he satisfied the popular taste. In his prose discourses he was as considerate of his readers; "I study as far as I can," he says, "to shun prolixity." Occasionally we can detect a note of regret that he, a scholar and a critic, should be compelled by poverty to pander to the vulgar. But his modesty reassures him and, unlike the unyielding Ben, he convinces himself that, as his hack-work is not literature, the rules do not apply.

Heywood's references to his contemporaries and his "judging of Authors" are instructive. His views on the ancients are naturally merely traditional, and though he quotes from a large number of medieval and Renaissance writers, his valuation of them is of no value. He names one or two non-dramatic English men of letters, Spenser, Henry Holland, Stowe, the "separistical humourist" Prynne, &c.; but he desisted from reckoning up all who had written in English, as he had found "the like learnedly done by an approved good scholler" (i. e. Francis Meres). He has more to say, however, about the dramatists, nearly all of whom he mentions in one of the most pleasing passages of his non-dramatic work:

> Our moderne Poets to that passe are driven,
> Those names are curtal'd which they first had given;
> Greene, who had in both Academies ta'ne
> Degree of Master, yet could never gaine
> To be called more than Robin . . .
> Marlo, renowned for his rare art and wit,
> Could ne're attaine beyond the name of Kit;
> Although his Hero and Leander did
> Merit addition rather. Famous Kid
> Was called but Tom. Tom Watson, though he wrote
> Able to make Apollo's selfe to dote
> Upon his Muse; for all that he could strive,

Yet never could to his full name arrive.
Tom Nash (in his time of no small esteeme)
Could not a second Syllable redeeme.
Excellent Bewmont, in the foremost ranke
Of the rar'st Wits, was never more than Franck.
Mellifluos Shake-speare, whose inchanting Quill
Commanded Mirth or Passion, was but Will.
And famous Iohnson, though his learned Pen
Be dipt in Castaly, is still but Ben.
Fletcher and Webster, of that learned packe
None of the mean'st, yet neither was but Iacke.
Deckers but Tom, nor May, nor Middleton.
And hee's now but Iacke Foord that once was Iohn.
(*Hierarchie of the Blessed Angels*, page 243).

The omission of Massinger and Marston from the above list is curious. It is possible that Marston was among Heywood's few enemies: the opening lines of *The Fair Maid of the Exchange* are remarkably like a parody of Marston and in the same play we are introduced to one of the numerous Juvenals of the day:

There liv'd a Poet in this towne,
(If we may terme our moderne Writers Poets)
Sharp-witted, bitter-tongu'd, his penne of steele,
His inke was temper'd with the biting juyce,
And extracts of the bittrest weeds the grew,
He never wrote but when the elements
Of Fire and Water tilted in his braine.

If Heywood attacked Marston in these lines, it was not, however, because he was of the Jonsonian faction in the Poetomachia. The reproof in the *Apology for Actors* can hardly apply to any one but Jonson: "The liberty which some arrogate to themselves, committing their bitterness and liberall invectives against all estates, to the mouthes of children, supposing their juniority to be a priviledge for any rayling, be it never so violent, I could advise all such, to curbe and limit this presumed liberty within the bands of discretion and government." The unnamed objects of Heywood's other criticisms are not so easily guessed. On certain criticasters, "who will not or dare not . . . adventure the expence of one serious hour in any laborious work" of value, and who yet "ambush the commendable labour of others," Heywood is specially severe: and the various satirists, epigrammatists, sonneteers, and plagiarists, all come in for a share of his spleen. (I am assuming that *The Fair Maid of the Exchange* is his.)

If there is one loss which a lover of the Elizabethans must regret, it is the disappearance (the words seem to imply even within Heywood's own lifetime) of his "Lives of all the Poets Moderne and Forreigne." Much would have been merely a repetition of received opinions on the classics. But Heywood would have made an admirable chronicler of the drama, as any one who has read his pleasantly garrulous prose works knows. He was familiar with all the playwrights from 1596 till 1642, besides possessing trustworthy information about those who had died before he came to London. He was himself an actor for many years and in several companies. He was both a scholar and a publicist, with unexampled opportunities for acquiring the necessary facts: his association with the court as a minor laureate, his duties as a city poet, his residence at Cambridge, his hack-work for the stationers and the theatrical managers, his thorough knowledge of the stage and of dramas (he is constantly quoting or absorbing into his own plays the phrases of others), his complete acquaintance with the town, reputable and disreputable, a combination of qualifications which none of his contemporaries had, must have resulted in a book unique in literary history. The loss of Heywood's promised reply to Prynne we can bear with more composure. One such work as *Histrio-Mastix* is enough for any language.

Such, in brief, is Heywood's contribution to criticism. If there is little in it that is original, yet as the work of the most typical Elizabethan, though not one of the greatest, it helps us, by its very crudity and lack of system and by the discrepancy between theory and practice, to understand better the dispensation under which Shakespeare and his fellows were working.

Oriel College,
Oxford, England.

ARTHUR MELVILLE CLARK.

STANZA-CONNECTION IN THE *FAIRY QUEEN*

John Hughes, in his Queen Anne edition of Spenser (1715) points to what would seem an obvious disadvantage of the Spenserian stanza. "The same Measure," he says, "closed always by a full Stop, in the same Place, by which every Stanza is made as it were a distinct Paragraph, grows tiresom by continual Repeti-

tion, and frequently breaks the sense, when it ought to be carry'd on without Interruption."

Thomas Warton and other later critics have repeated the same charge of Procrustean monotony; and this danger would seem so logically inevitable in the employment of Spenser's highly artificial stanza throughout a long narrative that it becomes important to ask why reasonably sympathetic readers actually feel so seldom any serious inconsecutiveness or choppiness in the poem's flow.

There are at least four devices, all deserving further study, by which Spenser solders together his stanzas and minimizes the jar occasioned by the final alexandrine:—

(I) One is the running over of the rime from one stanza into the next, the 'c' rime of one stanza becoming the 'a' or 'b' rime of the following (*e. g.*, II, i, 20-21; IV, x, 42-43; V, x, 31-32).

(II) Another is the employment of recurrent lines, as frequently in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*. Thus in I, v, 8 and 9 the first lines are identical: "So th' one for wrong, the other striues for right." Stanzas 16 and 17 of III, xi, are linked by virtual identity between the first line of the one and the last line of the other: "What boots it plaine, that cannot be redrest"—"What boots it then to plaine, that cannot be redrest?" And in V, iv, identical alexandrines close stanzas 17 and 18: "That what the sea vnto you sent, your owne should seeme."

(III) A yet more frequent expedient for preventing consecutive stanzas from breaking apart is Spenser's marked predilection for beginning stanzas with relatives and close-binding conjunctions. Even though the sentence comes to a definite and final close with the alexandrine, the poet prefers to begin the next line with a *Who* or *Which* rather than a personal pronoun or proper name, or else with some connective like *And, While, Where*.

(IV) The fourth device is the most interesting and subtle. It consists in carrying over important words from the alexandrine into the first line of the next stanza and there ringing harmonious changes upon them. To the unifying effect thus achieved is here added a musical beauty largely due to the difference of measure between hexameter and pentameter, which always suggests to me Militon's reference to

> many a winding bout
> Of linked sweetness long drawn out.

That Spenser's particular grace in this fashion was generally, though very cloudily, recognized in Milton's time is evidenced by R. C.'s preface to *The Chast and Lost Lovers* by William Bosworth, first printed in 1651. Bosworth occasionally indulges in such repetitious puerilities as the following,

> Down by which brook there sat a little lad,
> A little lad nam'd Epimenides.

In his defence his posthumous introducer, R. C., says:

"His making the end of one verse to be the frequent beginning of the other, (besides the art of the trope) was the labour and delight of Mr. Edmund Spencer, whom Sir Walt. Raleigh and Sir Kenelm Digby were used to call the English Virgil, and indeed Virgil himself did often use it, and in my opinion with a greater grace, making the last word only of his verse to be the beginning of the verse following, as

> Sequitur pulcherrimus Astur,
> Astur equo fidens, et versicoloribus armis. [*Aeneid* x, 180 f.]

Virgil hath nothing more usual than this graceful way of repetition, as those who are most conversant with him can readily witness with me."

That Spenser got from Vergil his first hint for this useful means of combining stanzas is most likely, but he developed his manner of repetition in ways far more varied and effective (despite Mr. R. C.) than anything that I have observed in the *Aeneid*—as indeed his need of effective variety was much greater than Vergil's.

Only relatively seldom does Spenser employ the strict Vergilian form of repetition, echoing the last word or two of the alexandrine at the opening of the next line; *e. g.* (I, iv, 8-9):

> As enuying her selfe, that too exceeding shone.
> Exceeding shone, like *Phoebus* fairest childe.

I count in the entire *Fairy Queen* fourteen other examples of this form of stanza connection. (I, xi, 20-21, 50-51; xii, 23-24; II, v. 26-27; (?)viii, 20-21; ix, 7-8; III, i, 20-21; ii, 7-8; IV, i, 31-32; iii, 21-22; (?)v, 5-6; (?)vii, 18-19; VI, v, 16-17; x, 26-27.)

In three other, more definitely Spenserian ways, repetition is employed as a means of stanza connection:—

(a) Occasionally the last word or words of the alexandrine recur, not at the beginning, but at the end of the next line; thus (I, v, 10-11):

> To after-send his foe, that him may ouertake?
> Goe caytiue Elfe, him quickly ouertake.

or (III, v, 8-9):

> Yet she loues none but one, that *Marinell* is hight.
> A Sea-nymphes sonne, that *Marinell* is hight,
> Of my deare Dame is loued dearely well.

In the second example the repetition is also of the character of type 'c,' described below. Type 'a' is found with a variation in IV, vi, 36-37:

> But no where could her find, nor tydings of her heare.
> When *Scudamour* those heauie tydings heard.

(b) Words from the beginning of the alexandrine are repeated, usually with a turn of thought, in the next line; *e. g.*, I, iv, 34-35:

> How many mischieues should ensue his heedless hast.
> Full many mischiefes follow cruell *Wrath*.

or, II, x, 3-4:

> Thy name, O soueraine Queene, to blazon farre away.
> Thy name, O soueraine Queene, thy realme and race.

or, VI, x, 11-12:

> All raunged in a ring, and dauncing in delight.
> All they without were raunged in a ring.

Other examples of this type are I, xii, 21-22; II, iv, 34-35; vii, 57-58; ix, 46-47; III, ii, 16-17; (?)iv, 29-30; vi, 26-27, 39-40; viii, 7-8; x, 53-54; IV, iii, 12-13, 42-43; v, 42-43; xii, 2-3; V, iv, 13-14; v, 32-33; (?)VII, vi, 14-15.

(c) The last and most common, as well as most effective, type of repetition occurs where the concluding words of the alexandrine are not simply echoed, but applied, elaborated, and played upon throughout the opening verse of the next stanza; *e. g.*, I, ii, 44-45:

> Then turning to his Lady, dead with feare her found.
> Her seeming dead he found with feigned feare.

II, i, 8-9:

> Vouchsafe to stay your steed for humble misers sake.
> He stayd his steed for humble misers sake.

IV, ii, 35-36:

> And wondrous chast of life, yet lou'd of Knights and Lords.
> Full many Lords, and many Knights her loued.

V, xi, 13-14:

> And with his mortal steel quite throgh the body strooke.
> Through all three bodies he him strooke attonce.

Other examples are I, iv, 2-3, 9-10; vii, 34-35; ix, 43-44; xi, 11-12; II, i, 20-21, 53-54; ii, 29-30; xi, 26-27; xii, 51-52; III (Introductory stanzas), 1-2; ii, 43-44; v, 25-26; 45-46; vii, 47-48; viii, 36-37; 39-40, 41-42; xi, 9-10, 10-11; xii, 28-29, 38-39; IV, v, 30-31; vi, 14-15; ix, 17-18; V, i, 6-7, 8-9; ix, 23-24; x, 3-4; VI, viii, 15-16; (?)x, 25-26; xii, 36-37.

Some interesting results appear when one counts the total number of instances of this use of repetition to connect stanzas in the first three books of the *Fairy Queen* and in the last three. I find forty-eight examples in Books I-III as against twenty-six in Books IV-VI. Book III has many more than any other, namely twenty-two—nearly as many as are found in the whole of the last three books. Book IV has thirteen, as many as are found in either Book I or Book II; Book V has only seven, and Book VI a bare half-dozen. The cantos on Mutability have only one inconspicuous and perhaps unintentional example. It looks as if Spenser made consciously increasing use of the artifice through Book III, and then gradually gave it up as he acquired the uncanny naturalness both of narrative and versification which is so remarkable in the fifth and sixth books.

TUCKER BROOKE.

Yale University.

REVIEWS

Manual de Pronunciación Española. By T. NAVARRO TOMÁS. Madrid: Publicaciones de la "Revista de filología española," 1918.

This work appeared in the nick of time, and was hailed with enthusiasm by our Spanish "confrérie." It is now high time that at least an estimate were made as to its usefulness.

Some excellent features may be stated in the beginning. Mr. Navarro Tomás has a very good clear style, and where obscurities

occur they are rather of conception than of expression. The material is well organized. The form of presenting examples, barring a few exceptions, is very clear. The great abundance of phonetic texts is (in spite of the transcription used) an excellent feature.

The author has rendered a great service to his own countrymen in this contribution, putting within reach of all Spaniards proof of the existence of a phonetic problem for them. Mr. Navarro Tomás is one of the first Spaniards to come out frankly as an advocate of a multi-vowel system for Spanish. He has a good chapter on accent, where as a compiler he appears at his best. But the feature especially worthy of consideration is his chapter on intonation and the accompanying texts. This chapter deserves especial commendation as an essay in a field which has hitherto received scant attention, and in it we have his greatest contribution to phonetics.

The author professes to take as a norm of good pronunciation (1) that which is used in Castile in the conversation of cultivated persons. But, he says (2), "su uso, sin embargo, no se reduce á esta sola región, sino que, recomendada por las personas doctas, difundida por las escuelas y cultivada artísticamente en la escena, en la tribuna y en la cátedra, se extiende más o menos por las demás regiones de lengua española."

In our opinion, when the author takes as a basis the differing speeches of ten or twelve Castilian provinces, throwing out all provincialisms, as he says he does, and then admits as identical the pronunciation of a more or less considerable part of the rest of the Spanish-speaking world, he normalizes, idealizes, and delocalizes to such an extent that we have no longer a Castilian pronunciation, or any really definite or actual pronunciation. Such a pronunciation is an imaginary and theoretical synthesis which cannot form the basis for any scientific analysis of sounds.

The author maintains the unity of this Spanish pronunciation which he calls "correcta." He says that the different elements, chiefly provincial in origin, which form the intellectual classes in Madrid spontaneously adopt this pronunciation, and adds: "Esto hace, en efecto, que sea frecuente encontrar en Madrid asturianos, gallegos, aragoneses, catalanes y hasta andaluces y americanos—que son los más pertinaces en la conservación de su acento—tan

diestros en pronunciación correcta como los más castizos castellanos."

The writer begs to register extreme skepticism as to the frequency and as to the "chasteness" of such Castilian; for example, he is extremely well satisfied with his own pronunciation of English. He speaks neither with a nasal twang, nor with a Southern drawl, does not use cacuminal consonants, etc., but he does not believe that a phonetician worthy of the name would be deceived by his rather good imitation of, should one say "Londonese" or standard speech of southern England.

From a phonetic point of view, the unity of correct world-Spanish is like the unity of correct world-English speech, *imaginary*. Its existence can be affirmed only by allowing so great a "range" for a given sound (especially vowel) that a neophyte might recognize the lack of phonetic unity.

Mr. Navarro Tomás was born in La Roda in Albacete, in the extreme southeastern corner of New Castile. The writer is not familiar with the speech of this region, and further has no means of judging what influence the author's pronunciation has on his analyses; but whatever it be, the fact remains that he minimizes dialectical differences, and normalizes Castilian by a tendency toward a reduction to Spanish.

American teachers of Spanish are likely to overestimate the importance of a purely Castilian pronunciation as compared with a good Spanish pronunciation. But the reason is clear, namely, the desire to have the best model possible; and why not, if one has the choice, even if the American student rarely acquires as good an imitation as many provincial Spaniards.

On the other hand, the native teachers of Spanish (of whom an infinitesimal proportion are Castilian), as a matter of stock in trade and as a matter of amour propre, solidarity, and prestige, are unwilling to admit that they have not a first-class Castilian pronunciation. Hence they minimize the dialectical differences in Spanish.

The chief device of provincial Spaniards, especially teachers, who desire to escape from their native dialect is to speak Spanish with exaggerated correctness, adopting largely what is known as "el estilo de maestro." This speech is quite artificial, precise, affected, and presents a very exaggerated use of close vowels.

Neither this style nor an imitation of it can be classed as good Castilian.

However, at least so long as native teachers with one accord acclaim the beauties of Castilian pronunciation, the burden of proof will rest upon them to show that their speech is a sufficiently good imitation of Castilian to serve for all practical purposes. To do this effectively, they must really become acquainted with the chief differences. Else, in the long run the denial of their existence will prove "contraproducente." Moreover, here reference is not had to patent differences known even to the most uneducated Spaniards, namely such as *s* for *θ*, etc. For, if the teacher does not know more than the ignorant "layman" about Spanish pronunciation, with what authority can he speak?

The case as between Southern England and American English on the one hand, and as between Castilian and American or provincial Spanish, on the other hand, is similar in its broad general aspects. To mention only two capital parallel differences between American and provincial Spanish and American English on the one hand, and Castilian and standard south-of-England speech, on the other hand, we have in the first place the similar much more advanced development of the obscure or semi-obscure vowels in the former speeches in places where Southern English (of England) and Castilian, respectively, present a closer and more carefully articulated vowel.

As to Castilian and Spanish, the degree of obscuration of the vowel is quite important as bearing on vowel quality, not only as regards the syllables in which these semi-obscure vowels occur, but especially, in view of the great sensitiveness of Castilian vowels to metaphonic influences, as regards other syllables. This is likewise quite important in its direct effect on syllable division and consonantal liaison. In general, we notice in American Spanish a tendency to reduce the close vowels to a medium open vowel. A second great difference envisaged in the parallel drawn above is in intonation.

It is then in conclusion not only not "common," as Navarro Tomás says, "to find Galicians, Catalonians, and even Andalusians and Americans as skillful in the correct pronunciation as the most pure Castilians," but it is exceedingly rare. Is the American student or teacher willing to trust Mr. Navarro Tomás's ears if

he does not hear the differences both here and in the case of foreign sounds, as noted below?

Here we have the great weakness of many of the experimental phoneticians. They will not confine themselves to conclusions drawn from mechanical records, but insist on dogmatizing as to what they hear, when they have never spent the indispensable ten or twenty years training their ears to hear correctly.

Mr. Navarro Tomás's comparisons of Spanish vowels with those of English, French, and German show lack of familiarity with the vowel sounds of those languages. He says Spanish *e* sounds a little less close than the *e* in French *chanté,* German *fehlen,* English *pane;* open *e* sounds approximately like *e* in French *perte,* German *fett,* English *let;* medium ***a*** like ***a*** in French *part,* English *bath,* German *was;* close *o* less close than *o* in French *chose,* English *obey,* German *dose;* close *i* is generally less closed and less tense than the *i* in French *vie,* German *sieben,* English *be,* etc.

If a vowel is a little less close than the *o* (which is not a close *o*) in the English *əbei,* how much of an *o* is it, and how close? If the Spanish *e* is a little less close than the diphthong in the English *pane* (and *e* in German *fehlen* and French *chanté*), how much of an *e* is it, and how close? Mr. Navarro Tomás should accept these English, French, and German sounds as presented by Sweet, Jespersen, Viëtor, Passy, etc.

Mr. Navarro Tomás states very clearly his object, namely to avoid all subtleties, and present a simple and practical handbook on pronunciation (page 5). Especially in view of this object, we should say that among the many errors of judgment, and by no means the least, is his choice of a phonetic transcription unknown to most students, especially American students, whereas that of the International Phonetic Association is widely known. For a manual this is a serious defect.

Upon the publication of *La Phonétique castillane*[1] (a book of research), one reviewer threw up his hands in horror at sixteen oral vowels for Castilian. (*La Phon. cast.,* p. 21.)

But for the *i* and *u* sounds alone (including *j* and *w* semi-vowels, but excluding the consonant "*j*") Mr. Navarro Tomás gives in his simple, practical manual no less than ten sounds, one more for

[1] M. A. Colton, *La Phonétique castillane,* Paris, 1909.

i and *u* than for all other oral vowels combined, the total being nineteen oral vowels.

These *i* and *u* sounds exist, of course, in one way or another, and are discussed in *La Phonétique castillane* repeatedly, pp. 71, 172, 197 (*cf.* pp. 42, 67-70). But even in that book, where the author was not limited by Navarro Tomás's simple and practical purpose, these sounds are reduced in the table of vowels to about half Navarro Tomás's figure (excluding *j*, which serves in *La Phon. cast.* as both semi-vowel and consonant "*j*").

If the author had made out a vowel triangle, not only should we judge more clearly as to what shade he assigns to each of his vowels, but he himself might have been able to see the extraordinarily disproportionate development and importance he was assigning to the *i*'s and *u*'s as compared to the various *a, o, e.* On the other hand, he did not seem to see the similar disproportionate multiplicity of certain consonants in his table, p. 60.

Araujo presents a much better proportioned table of chief vowel sounds (*La Fonetika Kastellana,* p. 33; as this book is out of print, see *La Phonétique castillane,* p. 74, for a copy thereof), which he introduces as follows: "Resumiendo el precedente estudio en un cuadro sinóptico, tendremos que las vocales castellanas con sus variantes más caracterizadas, son las siguientes: ᴀ, *a; ö, è, e, ɐ; i, í; ɔ, o, ọ; ù, u, v.*"

This list would be more acceptable if the *v* were omitted; but, as it is, Araujo stresses the common phonetic principle of the usual development of the *e*'s in languages. He says of *e:* "Este sonido es el más rico en matices, como en general de todas las lenguas, etc." Here then we find Navarro Tomás in direct contradiction with his long list of *i*'s and *u*'s as compared with the few *e*'s; hence, Araujo's table of most characteristic vowels would be better for a student's manual than that of Navarro Tomás, as the former places the emphasis in the right place instead of (1) presenting a multitude of hairsplitting varieties of *i* and *u,* and (2) presenting a system of obscure vowels far too developed and exaggerated for pedagogic use.

It is interesting to note that Wulff, in his *Chapitre de phonétique,* presents the following vowels (excluding a weak consonant *u*): 3 *a*'s; 6 *e*'s (including *oe*); 2 *i*'s; 2 *u*'s; 4 *o*'s; in all, seventeen oral vowels. It will be seen in *La Phon. cast.,* p. 21, that we have

given sixteen oral vowels. But this divergence is not significant, as we have there included the semiobscure ĕ (pp. 67-70), or e⁴ in a category with other *e* sounds, largely for the sake of avoiding undue multiplicity of vowels in our table of principal sounds.

In Wulff's list (cited in *La Phon. cast.*, p. 87), notice the great number of *e*'s as compared to *i*'s and *u*'s. Arranged in order of numerousness according to Wulff in decreasing series, we have *e, o, a,* 6, 4, 3, and *i, u,* 2, 2. Mr. Navarro Tomás just reverses this order, assigning some ten shades to *i* and *u,* and three shades to each of the other vowels, *a, o, e.*

After the foregoing summary, a detailed consideration of the author's vowel analyses is unnecessary. He pays very little attention to the vowels, devoting, if we include examples but exclude long literary citations, about a dozen pages to them.

However, it may be profitable to consider further and more at length a few features of his group analyses, even at the risk of wearying the reader. If, in a "simple, practical" manual, the author gives ten varieties of *i*'s and *u*'s, more or less (or even six, for that matter), what analyses could be expected from him in a book of scientific research? To Mr. Navarro Tomás, these *i*'s and *u*'s represent not subtleties, but real and considerable differences of timbre. For he says: "Las modificaciones que suelen producirse por metafonía ó armonía de timbre entre las vocales de sílabas contiguas se reducen de ordinario en la pronunciación correcta, á leves y sútiles matices, cuyo análisis puede sin perjuicio omitirse en la enseñanza práctica del idioma" (p. 36.)[2]

It is to be inferred, therefore, that the vertical distance, or jaw-tongue separation from palate, *i. e.,* the difference in quality between each of the ten *i*'s and *u*'s is much greater than is the case with the "sutiles matices" of metaphony, else the author would have omitted them in a simple practical manual. Hence, in making out a vowel triangle for Navarro Tomás, one would be justified in allotting a normal or appropriate distance between these *i*'s and *u*'s. Let the reader try it and see how impossible such a triangle would be with so much space taken up by those vowels as to leave comparatively little for all *a*'s, *o*'s, *e*'s.

But our only other recourse is the other horn of the dilemma,

[2] The note, p. 36, although the only direct citation of *La Phon. cast.*, is erroneous, particularly as to "sin dejar de ser cerrada," etc.

namely, as will be shown according to Navarro Tomás's own analyses, that these ten *i*'s and *u*'s are infinitesimal vowel shades, which have no place, as given, either in a manual or anywhere else.

For close *i* and close *u*, respectively, the author gives "abertura de las mandíbulas unos 4 mm. entre los incisivos"; for the close *e* and *o*, respectively, "abertura de las mandíbulas, 6 mm." $6 - 4 = 2$ mm. 2 mm. is the total distance between close *i* and close *e*. Then what mandibular separation should we expect as a range for all the *i*'s or *u*'s? Let that distance be "n," or shall we say 1 mm?, assuming the range is one-half the total distance. Throwing out the more consonantal variety of *i*, let us divide the total distance by $4 = n \div 4 = .25$ n (or .25 mm?).

The author does not give the tongue palate separation; but if he did, the separation between each of these varieties would of necessity be either "n," letting n = normal distance, or .25 n. (or less); that is, these distances between *i* (or *u*) and the next shade of *i* would be either normal, with an extraordinary predominance of *i*'s and *u*'s for a vowel triangle, or else the distances would be infinitesimal and hairsplitting, especially in a manual, where practical simplicity is promised by the author.

But the latter of the two analyses, undoubtedly the correct one, is further rendered less tenable by his statement, previously made by predecessors, viz.: that Spanish close *i* is less close than that of French, German, etc. He should also state that Spanish open *i* is less open than that of English and German, instead of "suena aproximadamente como la *i* en ingl. *bit, think;* al. *mit, nicht.*" Hence in reality there is less than the normal space, if we assume German, French, etc., as normal, for the four or five Spanish *i*'s. A placing of four or five *i*'s within this narrow space is inadmissible crowding.

Of the semi-vowel *i* he says: "se pronuncia aún algo más abierta que en los casos anteriores" (p. 39), etc. But if a semi-vowel (semi-consonant) is more open than its corresponding vowel, then such a statement would seem to be based on the peculiar conception that consonants are more open than vowels. A similar case is discussed in *La Phon. cast.*, p. 98 (Rambeau cites this in his review of *La Phon. cast.*, in *Die Neueren Sprachen*, XXI, 401-7).

The author divides semi-vowels into two classes, semi-vowels and semi-consonants. But his description, articles 48 and 67, is

merely that of an on-glide for the semi-vowels, and an off-glide for the semi-consonants. Such a method of classification, if applied to all vowels and all consonants, might readily double, if not triple, the number of sounds to be classified: *e. g.* (1) a *p* initial without on-glide, (2) a *p* medial with neither on-glide nor off-glide, (3) a *p* final without off-glide. The author is addicted to such methods of classification, presenting three *n*'s: *n* in *mano; n* in *onza; n* in *monte;* three *l*'s: *l* in *luna; l* in *alzar; l* in *falda,* etc., all of which is contrary to phonetic practice, and seems needlessly to multiply sounds and complicate classification.

In the matter of the semi-obscure vowels, the author exaggerates greatly, not only as to their analysis, but also especially as to their use. The five vowels ɐ̞; o̞; ʊ̞; ə; ɪ̞ exist in one way or another; they are mentioned by Araujo, and treated in *La Phon. cast.,* pp. 42, 68-71, 172, 197, etc. But it will be noted that in Araujo's table of chief vowels only one of these vowels is given, *viz.:* ə. Certainly in our judgment at the very most only two of them, ɐ̞, ə, could even by stretching a point be placed in a manual, or for that matter even in a table of normal vowels in general. The remaining vowels, o̞, ʊ̞, ɪ̞, are not either sufficiently developed or sufficiently regular in appearance for such a classification in Castilian, however, it may be in Spanish.

Many of the rules for occurrence of a given vowel seem objectionable; *e. g.,* speaking of *e cerrada,* he says: "Hállase en sílaba abierta acentuada, en sílaba cerrada por n, s." This latter cannot be maintained in general. It is true, however, that in final syllables before *s, e* is more often close than elsewhere for reasons which are easily discernible.

As to the nasal vowels in general, he exaggerates their occurrence, saying: "Una vocal entre dos consonantes nasales resulta en general completamente nasalizada, ex. mãno," etc. This observation would be more true of a certain provincial Spanish, but can hardly be maintained in general of Castilian. In the one case of vowel plus *n* plus *f,* he minimizes concerning the fall of *n.*

The only reference noted in the *Manual* in regard to anything but conventional or orthographic syllable division is on page 129, where the author seems to accept in part the theories of *La Phon. cast.* He gives there the transcriptions pas-sa, θe̞s-sɐ̞, etc. This may be noted also as somewhat contradictory to his rule that *e*

plus *s* in close syllable is close *e*, as he here gives open *e* in θęs-sɐ̯.

The unaccented vowel in the final absolute is, says the author on page 157, the longest of the weak vowels, but he denies the prolongation of the final vowel, claiming that to be a popular pronunciation. He notes, however, that foreigners shorten this vowel too much. If that is the case, then these vowels are probably neither so short nor so obscure as represented. The length of the vowel in the final absolute in Castilian is so well recognized a fact that one may well ask whether the author is justified in shortening it to ɐ̯, ə, etc., in his "pronunciación correcta" if he really means that to be Castilian. Mention has already been made of the larger aspects of these analyses, *viz.*, as to synthetic influences.

The author's practical rule that Spanish vowels are always short, even with the limitations added as to relative length, do not seem to be in accord with the widely differing lengths that he assigns in hundredths of a second for vowels. These lengths vary from 4.5 to 20 hundredths of a second. One would suppose that limits much less considerable than these might still be sufficient to provide for regular long and short vowels.

In the last paragraph but one above, we have referred to the unaccented vowel in the final absolute. Mr. Navarro Tomás analyzes this vowel as what might be called a semi-obscure and relaxed vowel. He states: "Su duración iguala o supera, en general, á la de la vocal fuerte precedente." But how can these vowels, in this position, be so long if they are obscure? The fact is that they are not obscure. Proof of this is afforded by what the author states of the various vowels of this class in his descriptive analyses, viz., that ɐ̯, ɔ, ʊ, ə, ɪ̯, readily become clear vowels when lengthened, stressed, or pronounced carefully. But this unusual length (p. 157) given for an unstressed vowel is really proof that the analysis as given elsewhere (p. 40, 43, 46, etc.) is inaccurate. Furthermore, this throws together in the same category relaxed vowels varying in length from 4.5 to 10 or 15 hundredths of a second—according to his measurements.

No mention is made of quantity stress, a matter of considerable importance in Spanish.

The chapter on intonation is very interesting, and until further investigation may well be accepted as a contribution to Spanish phonetics. Although a few stress groups might be shorter, the divisions seem in general well made.

In conclusion, it seems to us that the author has made Spanish his basis rather than Castilian; that he tends in certain cases toward a symmetry in analysis which is hardly justified by the facts. Often, however, he seems rather to overlook the larger synthetic aspects of the phonetic material, and to tend in vowel analysis toward the traditional popular Spanish view that, if there is any variation in Spanish vowels, it is due to the following consonant. It is only just to state in this connection that the author in general properly emphasizes several of the important basic conditions of phonetic analysis.

It will be unnecessary to sum up all of our observations; suffice it to say that in view of the transcription chosen; the superabundance of, and hairsplitting varieties of *i* and *u;* the exaggerated and extended use of obscure vowels; and erroneous rules for the use of certain vowels, the *Manual* can hardly be called a successful fulfillment of the author's ambition, as stated in the Introduction, namely, to write a simple practical handbook of pronunciation.

As pointed out in the beginning, the book is by no means without value. It would indeed be unfair not to recognize the great difficulty of execution inherent in the task which the author set for himself. In general, therefore, it may be said that Mr. Navarro Tomás has made a very creditable beginning in the field of phonetics, and we wish him every success in this rich Spanish field, where there is room for hundreds of investigators instead of one or two.

MOLTON AVERY COLTON.

U. S. Naval Academy.

A Catalogue of the Library of the late John Henry Wrenn. Compiled by HAROLD B. WRENN. Edited by THOMAS J. WISE. Austin, University of Texas, 1920.

The Wrenn Catalogue, beautifully printed on Whatman handmade paper, is at last out, in a limited edition of one hundred and twenty copies, a number of which have been presented to university libraries for the future use of scholars. Thomas J. Wise, bibliographer of Coleridge, Landor, Wordsworth, Tennyson, Browning and Swinburne, and officer of the English Bibliographical

Society, informs us in the *Preface* that he is responsible for the original purchase of many of the volumes, as well as for the editing of the *Catalogue;* and that Harold B. Wrenn, son of the wealthy banker who made the collection, was at great pains in compiling and collating the items. The *Catalogue,* we are told, contains the results of twenty years' "earnest and discriminating" collecting; and is "full of records of books of real literary value for which the pages of any other catalogue will be searched in vain." The University of Texas should rejoice at the acquisition of such a library; and American scholarship, at the printing of such a serious bibliographical work, which should at once show us where to put our hands on rare editions, and how to differentiate those editions and to fix the authorship of uncertain or anonymous works.

Unfortunately, however, the *Catalogue* has been put together in a peculiarly inconvenient fashion. The works of the Younger Colman, for instance, are interpolated between those written solely by his father and those written by his father with the supposed assistance of Garrick. "Isaac Bickerstaffe" appears as a separate heading, with no cross-reference under Swift and only an inconspicuous note under "Bickerstaffe." "Peter Pindar's" satires, on the other hand, are all listed under Wolcot—without any reference under "Pindar." One of Mason's "Macgreggor" satires appears under Mason; one, under "Macgreggor," again without cross-reference. An unhappy climax is achieved when the cataloguer apparently fails to realize that his two copies of Horace Walpole's *Medalist* (1741) are really duplicates, and naïvely lists one under Walpole and the other under Anonymous.

Foreign authors and translated works are treated very cavalierly. *Cartouche, or the Robbers. By Monsieur Le Grand,*[1] London, 1772, is, strangely enough, listed as anonymous; Gresset's *Ver-vert* appears only under the name of the translator, Jerningham; and the same is true of Murphy's translations of Metastasio, Crébillon and Destouches. Van Laun's translation of Molière's *Works* appears under Molière; but Fielding's version of the *Mock Doctor* appears only under Fielding. All this means that the *Catalogue* is practically useless for students of comparative literature.

[1] Le Grand's authorship is unquestioned. See la Porte, *Dict. Dram.*, Paris, 1776. I owe this reference to the courtesy of Professor G. L. van Roosbroeck.

The listing of collaborated works, moreover, is often capricious. Whole plays, for instance, appear under Garrick, although he supplied merely a prologue or an epilogue. Thus Delap's *Hecuba* (1762) is listed under Garrick because he wrote the epilogue, but is not mentioned under Delap, who composed the play itself, or under Lloyd, who did the prologue. Five of Murphy's plays appear under the dubious joint-authorship of Garrick—he supplied a prologue for at least one of them. The *Gamester* (1753) ascribed to Moore and, very dubiously, to Garrick,[2] appears only under the latter; whereas *Gil Blas,* with the same attribution, appears only under Moore. Works, moreover, by Dow, Kelly, Hawkesworth, Townley and Miller,[3] are treated in like fashion.

Not only, however, is the material in the *Catalogue* ill-compiled, but, even more deplorable, a large share of it is very doubtful if not quite erroneous. Nearly every item bears the re-assuring statement, "the first edition." An edition of Thomas May's *The Heire,* dated 1633, for example, is so listed; whereas so common a reference-book as the *Dictionary of National Biography* mentions a quarto eleven years earlier. Two editions of Fletcher's *Elder Brother* appeared in 1637; and a comparison with both title-pages as given in the *British Museum Catalogue,* seems to show that the Wrenn library contains, not, as the *Catalogue* states, the first, but the second of these. *Eurydice, A Tragedy* (1759) is termed "the *First Edition* of the play in its revised form" under the "collaboration" of Aaron Hill. Dr. Brewster's recent dissertation on Hill gives nothing of it; Cushing, however, lists a drama of that name by David Mallet, in 1731; and the *British Museum Catalogue* lists a later "edition" in 1759. The *Wrenn Catalogue* makes no mention of Mallet.

The ascriptions of anonymous literature constitute, without question, the most unhappy feature of these five beautifully printed volumes. A handful of examples will serve as illustration. *Faire Em* is attributed to Robert Greene; whereas the play is regularly listed as anonymous, and his ridicule of it in the *Farewell to Folly* is well known.[4] The *Costlie Whore* is ascribed to Dekker and

[2] I can discover no reason for this ascription, and think it must be due to confusion with Shirley's *Gamesters,* revised by Garrick in 1758.

[3] *Mahomet* is listed under Garrick with incidental mention of Miller. According to Cushing, it is actually by Miller and Hoadley.

[4] See Moorman in the *Camb. Hist.,* v, 237; and Baker, v, 135..

Ford, for no apparent reason, except perhaps that the former is regularly accredited with the *Honest Whore* and the *Whore of Babylon.* The anonymous *Tuscan Treaty,* revised by Bond, appears under Hill, because the latter is supposed to have helped with the revision.[5] *Albion's Triumph* is listed under Akenside: according to Cushing, it is by Boyse. *Fashionable Friends* (1802) is given to Walpole, although it was printed five years after his death: Cushing attributes it, probably correctly, to Mary Berry.

Of the odd dozen anonymous attributions to Mason, moreover, almost all are at least highly dubious. His non-satiric works, he himself carefully collected and edited just before his death in 1797; none of these ascriptions are included in this collection; none have I found mentioned in Mason's voluminous correspondence, much of which is preserved in the letters of Walpole and Gray and in the *Harcourt Papers;* and, so far as I know, none of these ascriptions, except that of the poem *Mirth,* have ever been made before. Additional reasons to doubt exist in special cases. The *British Museum Catalogue* definitely lists the *Essay on Friendship* (1767), *Ranelagh* (1777) and *Fun* (1781) as Anonymous. The *Epistle from John, Lord Ashburton* (1785), brought out by Murray, can hardly be Mason's, in view of the bitter law-suit that the two had waged a few years before over the Gray copyright; and, indeed, practically none of these pieces were brought out by Mason's regular publishers: Almon for his anonymous and pseudononymous satires, and Dodsley for his other works, later succeeded by Ward of York. The *Ode to Handel,* if it be Mason's, constitutes his first published work. He would hardly have overlooked it in his collection of *juvenilia;* and his dislike of Handel[6] makes his authorship even more doubtful. The *Probationary Ode for the Laureatship of the Royal Academy* (1786), written apparently under the combined influence of "Peter Pindar"[7] and the *Rolliad,* is probably by Richard Tickell and his fellow wits of the *Shakespeare.*[8] At all events, it appeared several years after Mason's

[5] Dr. Brewster gives no authority for this, nor have I found any.

[6] Walpole *Letters,* London, 1880, VII, 26 n.

[7] Evidently a sort of reply to "Peter Pindar's" *Farewell,* as laureate to the Royal Academy. See *Mon. Rev.,* LXXXIV, 465.

[8] This could probably be established by an examination of their collected works, the *Poetical Miscellany* (1787), reviewed in the *Mon. Rev.,* LXXVIII,

last-known satire; and the *Monthly Review* certainly did not associate it either with his name or with the other satires that he wrote: it belongs to a different school.[9] And finally, two of the items here listed have regularly assigned authors: Cushing gives the *Goat's Beard* (1777) to William Whitehead, and Northup's *Bibliography of Gray* assigns the *Slight View of the Village and School of R———*, on rather good authority, to William Gerard Hamilton, and supplies the date, not 1745 as in the *Wrenn Catalogue,* but 1780. In short, one of Mason's undoubted satires is listed under his pseudonym, Macgreggor, and almost a dozen anonymous pieces are attributed to him, in defiance of ascriptions to other authors and the facts of his own life—and all this without the slightest doubt expressed or the slightest evidence adduced.[10] For entries such as these, "the pages of any other catalogue" would, indeed, "be searched in vain."

Such indiscretions, unfortunately, bulk large not only in minor, but even in important literary figures. In the Fielding attributions, the percentage of inaccuracy is almost as high as in Mason. We are fortunate in having, beside the usual reference-books, a carefully compiled check-list in Cross's bibliography.[11] Three of the Wrenn items have never apparently been recognized as possibly belonging to Fielding: *Darius' Feast* (1734), the *Statesman's Mirrour* (1741), and the *Heroes* (1745).[12] Five other ascriptions are almost certainly incorrect. *The Younger Brother* (1719), Fielding, if he wrote it, must have published at the age of twelve—a truly notable precocity. *Some Proposals for the Revival of Christianity* (1736) is listed as Skelton's in Cushing; the *Life and Adventures of a Cat* (1760), published after Fielding's death was

77. For the authorship of this, see *Cat. of Lib. of Cong.* and *Brit. Mus. Cat.* Unfortunately, I have not had access to a copy.

[9] The attribution arose, I fancy by confusion with the *Probationary Ode Extraordinary* by "the Rev. W. Mason"—actually a satire on Mason by the *Rolliad* wits. See *Mon. Rev.* LXXVIII, 77.

[10] In one case, we are told that the volume contains an inscription by the author; but it is hard to believe that an editor who did not take the trouble to consult the *Brit. Mus. Cat.*, employed an expert in *diplomatique* to compare this with Mason's autograph.

[11] W. L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding*, New Haven, 1918.

[12] This is, I fancy, the same pamphlet that the *Brit. Mus. Cat.* lists anonymously as 1749. One catalogue or the other may have mis-transcribed the date.

concocted by "some worthy inhabitant of Grub Street," if the reviewer is to be believed;[13] the *Intriguing Milliners* (1740) is by Robinson.[14] The *Wrenn Catalogue* declares this last work "frequently attributed to Fielding": I have found no such attributions; but, if they occur, I suspect it was merely by confusion with his *Intriguing Chambermaid.* The *Essay on Conversation* (1737), likewise, as Cross explains, has been mis-ascribed to Fielding, by confusion with the essay of a similar title in his *Miscellanies.*

The Defoe collection is the special boast of the editor; and, indeed, it contains a number of rare items such as *Due Preparations for the Plague* (1722). There is, however, much to give one pause: a comparison with Professor Trent's bibliography, the work of a life-time, in the *Cambridge History,* reveals the fact that the *Wrenn Catalogue* contains a large number of attributions that Trent saw fit to pass over. Here as elsewhere, the catalogue is avid of *juvenilia:* without doubt or query, it lists as Defoe's *The Loyal Protestants Vindication,* London, 1680, which, if he wrote it, must have been done at nineteen. From the time of George Chalmers to the present, Defoe bibliographers have hesitated to assign tracts to this period: of Wilson's five entries, two are known to belong to another writer and three have remained unsubstantiated. William Lee's only venture, *A Letter containing some Reflections on His Majesty's Declaration for Liberty of Conscience* (1687), he was later forced to assign to Bishop Burnet. Most modern students, while still hoping to discover tracts antedating 1690, confine themselves to beginning their lists with Defoe's acknowledged poem, *A New Discovery of an Old Intreague* (1691). Of the later Wrenn attributions, at least one, unhappily, is even more dubious. *Hanging no Dishonour . . . a Letter from Gentleman Harry now under Sentence of Death in Newgate . . . ,* dated by the editor 1709, is vouched for as Defoe's on the authority of a note said to be in Lee's handwriting. My attention was fortuitously called to the apparent identity of this tract with one listed in the *British Museum Catalogue* under Harry, and dated 1747—sixteen years after Defoe's death. A glance at the *Gentleman's Magazine,* moreover, confirms this date, and shows that

[13] *Crit. Rev.,* IX, 420, quoted in Cross.
[14] See Cushing.

Henry Simms, alias "gentleman Harry" was condemned for highway robbery early in 1747 and was executed in June of that year.[15] Surely prudence should have dictated that "gentleman Harry's" career be investigated before dating the tract 1709 and assigning it to Defoe.

Such a multiplicity of errors—for the present list is merely a selection of random examples—published under the editorship of an officer of the English Bibliographical Society, is rather shocking. The *Preface* contains an apology for mis-prints; but such mistakes as these cannot possibly have arisen from that source. Some of them are merely stupid blunders; but others, unfortunately, suggest an intentional desire to mislead, and to make the items appear more important than in fact they are—a practice that is as needless as it is vicious, for the collection contains many books of great value. To accuse Mr. Wise of such a thing is unthinkable; but, unhappily, there are many booksellers sufficiently unscrupulous to raise the market value of a pamphlet by calling it a first edition or ascribing it to Defoe or to Pope or even to Mason—especially if they find their purchasers careless or ignorant enough to be uncritical. Apparently, neither the compiler of the catalogue nor the editor, either took the pains to verify these ascriptions, or had the knowledge to recognize the errors; and they seem merely to have copied down many of the ascriptions, learned notes and so forth from the sales catalogues out of which they had bought the books. Where these notes show knowledge, as they occasionally do, of bibliographical reference-books, it is, I judge, merely because the trade-catalogue happened to belong to a respectable house, and was rather carefully compiled. It is, on the whole, a melancholy reflection that these five volumes of Whatman hand-made paper, beautifully printed, in a limited edition, the results of twenty years' "earnest and discriminating" collecting, should, for scholarly purposes, contain, along with some really valuable data, an odd collection of items and notes from the miscellaneous catalogues of first-, second- and third-class book-dealers during the last generation.

JOHN W. DRAPER.

Bryn Mawr College.

---

[15] *Gent.'s Mag.* XVII, 102, 293-4.

French Classicism, by C. H. C. Wright. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920. viii + 177 pp.

To treat this subject at all and especially to treat it in so brief a compass brings at once upon its author criticism of several kinds. There must be limits, yet practically to exclude great authors like Rabelais and La Fontaine makes one think that the term "classicism" is used in a somewhat artificial sense; to stop before the eighteenth century is not to tell the whole of the story announced in the title; as only the most essential features can be discussed in such short space, the author, when he ventures upon detail, often appears to distribute unevenly his praise and blame. He is apt both to dismiss difficult problems with facile explanations and to seem trite to specialists who are already familiar with more profound investigations of limited portions of his field.

Nevertheless there was need for the book. Its author tells us that when students first come to him they think French classicism means only the observance of the three unities. Many people of wider culture, prejudiced against this literary movement by dull imitations of it in England and elsewhere, often fail to appreciate its value. Professor Wright deserves our praise for undertaking to meet the needs of such readers and for attaining in his book so considerable a measure of success.

Starting with a thorough-going definition of classicism and a satisfactory account of its organization in Greece and Rome, he goes on to discuss its early manifestations in sixteenth-century France among poets, moralists, critics, and even men of action like Michel de l'Hospital. His chief emphasis is laid upon the classicism of the seventeenth century, particularly its culmination in the school of 1660. Here he devotes most of his space to general principles and the drama. Short chapters follow devoted to other forms of literature and to art. Some attention is also paid to the political and social system in the age of Louis XIV. The author expresses his ideas clearly and concisely and succeeds in holding the reader's interest. He shows a sympathetic understanding of most of the great authors he treats, genuine appreciation of the four protagonists of French classicism, Molière, Racine, Boileau, and Bossuet. His bibliographical information is very substantial. M. Lanson's *Esquisse d'une histoire de la tragédie française* (New York, 1920) and M. Charbonnel's *Pensée italienne au XVIe siècle et le courant libertin* (Paris, 1919), both of which would

have helped him, appeared, perhaps, too late for him to use them. The printing and proof-reading have been admirably done. In short the volume forms a useful, if incomplete introduction to the study of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century literature. There are, however, certain criticisms of it that must be made.

The emphasis has been placed so largely on general principles that individual authors are insufficiently characterized. This is especially true of the last chapters, devoted to prose forms and to art. They are so hurried that one regrets that they have been included. Legal oratory, for instance, is treated in a single page, most of which is devoted to an amusing passage from Perrault. There is a tendency to dwell upon the aesthetic principles set forth in critical writings rather than upon those expressed in the literary masterpieces themselves. Professor Wright does scant justice to Corneille. To explain the *Cid* merely as an effort at harmonizing a Spanish plot with the rules is far from accounting for its importance in the establishment of the modern psychological tragedy.[1] He is careful to show Corneille's subservience to certain Aristotelian dicta, but he fails to mention his independence of Aristotle in his views on the choice of a subject and the part to be assigned to *admiration*. And why quote (p. 132) Mr. Charleton's absurd comment that *Rodogune* is a "monstrous imbroglio"?

Difficult questions like those of Corneille's relations to Richelieu and to hostile criticism are settled (pp. 64 and 126) in the traditional way, while the special investigator remains unconvinced. In describing the evolution of comedy (p. 134), the author should have mentioned *les Visionnaires* rather than *Mélite*. *Don Sanche* is not really "another novelty" (p. 132), despite Corneille's statement to that effect. So important a characteristic of classical plays as the unity of action ought not to be dismissed with a bare mention (p. 124). To imply (pp. 65, 66) that every dramatist "unless he were Molière" neglected the common people of the audience for the sake of pedants and *précieux* is certainly an overstatement. "A ma gloire il manque une chose. Vulgaire, si tu ne m'entends," wrote Benserade in 1641, and there were others of his opinion.

H. Carrington Lancaster.

[1] Contrast the discussion of the same work by M. Lanson, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-60.

CORRESPONDENCE

La Préface des *Fables de La Fontaine:* Une Correction

Le second paragraphe de la *Préface* du recueil des *Fables* s'ouvre par une phrase qui semble avoir passé inaperçue et qui, pourtant, aurait dû arrêter au passage non seulement les éditeurs mais même les simples lecteurs attentifs:

. . . "Après tout, je n'ai entrepris la chose [d'écrire des Fables] *que sur l'exemple, je ne veux pas dire des anciens, qui ne tire point à conséquence pour moi,* mais sur celui des modernes."[1]

Sous la plume de La Fontaine, en 1668, près de vingt ans avant le *Siècle de Louis le Grand* de Charles Perrault, une pareille affirmation a de quoi surprendre. Et si on se souvient que, précisément, le Poème de Perrault n'eut pas de contradicteur plus véhément que La Fontaine dans l'*Epître à Huet,* la profession de "modernisme" littéraire impliquée dans la phrase en question paraît bien extraordinaire. Faudra-t-il admettre qu'en 1668 La Fontaine pensait ce que Perrault devait écrire en 1687? Mais, outre que cette hypothèse est démentie par toute l'œuvre de La Fontaine à cette époque,[2] elle ne tient pas debout devant l'examen du contexte. Voici en effet la suite immédiate de la phrase citée:

> "C'est de tout temps, et chez tous les peuples qui font profession de poésie, que le Parnasse a jugé ceci de son apanage. A peine les fables qu'on attribue à Esope virent le jour, que Socrate trouve à propos de les habiller des livrées des Muses.
>
> . . . . Socrate n'est pas le seul qui ait considéré comme sœurs la poésie et nos fables. Phèdre a témoigné qu'il étoit de ce sentiment; et, par l'excellence de son ouvrage, nous pouvons juger de celui du prince des philosophes. Après Phèdre, Aviénus a traité le même sujet."

La contradiction dans les termes est flagrante: Le même La Fontaine qui vient de déclarer que "*l'exemple des Anciens ne tire*

[1] Nous citons d'après le texte de l'Edition des Grands Ecrivains donnée par Regnier chez Hachette (Tome I). La *Préface* de 1668 est passée sans aucune variante appréciable dans toutes les éditions ultérieures.

[2] Voici ce qu'il fait dire aux Muses à propos d'Horace:

> Mais avons-nous l'esprit qu'autrefois à cet homme
> Nous savions inspirer sur le déclin de Rome?
> Tout est trop fort déchu dans le sacré vallon.
> *Clymène* (1659)

pas à conséquence pour lui," ne fait usage que de l'exemple desdits anciens, ne nous parle que d'eux. Il en est de même dans toute la suite de la *Préface* qu'il serait trop long de citer. C'est encore et toujours aux Anciens qu'il revient, à Phèdre dont il loue " l'élégance et l'extrême brièveté," à Térence dont Phèdre a su conserver " le vrai caractère et le vrai génie," à Quintilien dont il accepte dévotement l'autorité, à Socrate, à Platon, à Horace, à Esope enfin. C'est bien dans cette *Préface des Fables,* le même accent d'admiration pour les Anciens que, vingt ans plus tard, dans *l'Epître à Huet.*

Quant à ces modernes dont la phrase incriminée lui fait dire que c'est à leur exemple qu'il a entrepris les *Fables,* La Fontaine leur consacre six ou sept lignes pour dire:

" Enfin les modernes les ont suivis: nous en avons des exemples, non seulement chez les étrangers, mais chez nous. Il est vrai que, lorsque nos gens y ont travaillé, la langue était si différente de ce qu'elle est, qu'on ne les doit considérer que comme étrangers.[3]

Ainsi ces modernes sont non seulement " étrangers " par l'archaïsme de leur langue, mais ils sont comme s'ils n'avaient pas été, puisque La Fontaine se flatte d'être le premier, le pionnier, " d'ouvrir la carrière " et bien loin de tirer à conséquence leur exemple n'existe pas pour lui.

Naturellement, quand La Fontaine affecte d'ignorer les modernes, nous savons bien qu'il se vante et ce qu'il doit à Corrozet, à Haudent, à Nevelet, voire même à Marie de France et aux bons vieux Ysopets. Mais nous savons aussi—et cela suffit pour notre démonstration—qu'il ne cite jamais ces auteurs dans ses *Fables* et nous voyons dans cette *Préface* avec quelle prestesse il les escamote. Nous sommes donc en droit de dire qu'il y a une contradiction formelle entre les termes de toute la *Préface* et le passage que nous incriminons.

Or tout s'éclaircit si on admet que la phrase en question contient une leçon fautive, due à l'interversion de deux mots, *anciens* et *modernes,* et si on rétablit le texte ainsi:

[3] Comparez ce qu'il dit dans *Clymène* en parlant des auteurs français d'avant Marot:

> Au reste, n'allez pas chercher ce style antique
> Dont à peine les mots s'entendent aujourd'hui.
> Montez jusqu'à Marot et point par delà lui.
> Même son tour suffit. . . . .

Cela ne m'a point détourné de mon entreprise; au contraire, je me suis flatté de l'espérance que, si je ne courois dans cette carrière avec succès, on me donneroit au moins la gloire de l'avoir ouverte."

"Après tout, je n'ai entrepris la chose que sur l'exemple, je ne veux pas dire *des modernes, qui ne tire point à conséquences pour moi,* mais sur celui des *anciens.*"

Il suffit ainsi et il est nécessaire de remettre ces deux mots à leur place pour donner à la phrase un sens cohérent et logique.

Sans doute on peut s'étonner qu'une erreur de ce genre ait pu passer si longtemps inaperçue. Mais n'oublions pas qu'il s'agit d'une préface. Or le public lit peu les préfaces et les commentateurs même les plus avertis ne les épluchent guère. Quant à La Fontaine, bien qu'il fût en général aussi soigneux dans son travail d'écrivain que distrait dans sa vie pratique, il aura eu ce jour-là une petite somnolence et écrit un mot pour un autre. Comme son ami Vergier le lui disait à lui-même:

> Eh! qui pourrait être surpris
> Lorsque La Fontaine s'égare,
> Lui dont la vie est un tissu d'erreurs.[4]

Louis Cons.

Princeton University.

Seventeenth Century Reference to Shakespeare

The following seventeenth century (1649) reference to *1 Henry IV,* I, iii seems to be unknown:

> What do'st thou mean to stand behind the noon
> *And pluck bright honour from the pale fac'd Moon?*

(The italics are in the original.) The couplet is cited from a poem on the fourth page (unnumbered) of the introductory matter to a pamphlet called ΕΙΚΩΝ Η'ΠΙΣΤΗ. *Or, The faithfull Pourtraicture of a Loyall Subject, in Vindication of* ΕΙΚΏΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΉ, published in 1649.

F. B. Kaye.

Northwestern University.

Sylvestre Bonnard and the Fairy

In the January number of *M. L. N.* (p. 56) Professor B. M. Woodbridge draws an interesting parallel between the apparition of a fairy, perched on the *Chronique de Nurenberg,* to Sylvestre Bonnard and the apparition of a playful Cupid to Philetas in

[4] Vergier, *Lettre à La Fontaine.*

Daphnis and Chloë.[1] Yet, while Anatole France is no mean classical scholar, the most obvious influences on his work seem to be exercised by Renan and the *Conteurs* of the eighteenth century, in whose works a bibliophile and a sceptic would take delight: Jérôme Coignard, for instance, recalls Du Laurens' *Compère Matthieu.*[2] Now, the eighteenth century was quite fond of sophisticated and ironical fairies such as the one who played tricks on Sylvestre Bonnard.[3] To point to only one example, in *La Poupée* by M. de Bibiena (London, 1782. Reprinted in *Le XVIIIe siècle galant et littéraire,* 1891) a fairy takes the form of a doll, and is bought by an Abbé Philandre. While he is writing he is suddenly frightened by a voice (p. 209): "Mais je ne fus pas longtemps en suspens; la niche s'ouvrit et la poupée en sortit avec une petite démarche la plus aisée et la plus noble qu'on sauroit se figurer. Elle me salua en me faisant une révérence pleine d'une grâce infinie, et vint s'asseoir auprès de moi sur un tome des *Confessions du Comte de . . .*" This attitude resembles the one of Bonnard's fairy perched on the *Chronique de Nurenberg.* Moreover, even as Sylvestre Bonnard, who doubts the existence of fairies, suffers a sharp rebuff from the tiny lady, Philandre is censured by the impatient elf for his incredulity.

. . . Je suis une Sylphide. Une Sylphide! m'ecriai-je. Pourquoi cet étonnement? dit-elle, en prenant un air sévère. Ce n'est point de l'étonnement, lui dis-je, c'est de la joie. Vous êtes un imposteur, reprit-elle en se levant brusquement et frappant de son petit pied sur la table. . . Je tremblai; il me sembla que la foudre alloit tomber sur moi. . . Je sais ce que vous venez de penser au sujet d'un grand homme à qui vous devez de la vénération; je veux que vous me le disiez, et avec les mêmes termes que vous venez de prononcer en vous-même.

Il est vrai, lui repondis-je; j'ai pensé dans cet instant que les sylphes et les sylphides et tous les esprits élémentaires n'avoient jamais existé que dans l'imagination burlesque du comte de Gabalis. Mais je reviens de mon erreur, je rends la justice qui est due à cet homme illustre. Il m'est bien aisé de me convaincre puisque la vérité est devant mes yeux; puis-je me refuser au prodige que je vois? A ces mots elle se replaça sur le même tome des *Confessions du comte de . . .*, et s'appuya sur un autre plus élevé, qui étoit près de celui des *Confessions.* Comment dépeindre les grâces séduisantes que lui donnoit ce petit air penché?

---

[1] H. Potez in *Les Sources du Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard,* Mercure de France, 1910, compares the description of the outward appearance of the fairy to a passage from About's *Le Roi des Montaignes.*

[2] Cf. G. Michaut, *Anatole France,* p. 162.

[3] A number of eighteenth century fairy stories are listed in the *Catalogue . . . des livres de feu M. le Duc de la Valière,* VI, pp. 229-238. Fairies appear in a great number of other *Contes* of the epoch, and, as M. Michaut indicates, in the *Bibliothèque des Voyages.*

It is to be noted that a closer similitude exists between the apparition of the fairies in both *La Poupée* and *Le Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard,* than between the fairy in this last novel and Cupid in *Daphnis and Chloë.*

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

University of Minnesota.

A NOTE ON RICHARD CRASHAW

We now have evidence of Crashaw's precocity as a poet, of contemporary appreciation of him, of his taking Anglican orders, and an earlier date for his departure for Rome.

Under the date November 27, 1627, volume XIX of the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission [1] records the following (p. 128):

"A long list of persons to whom gowns and cloaks were given, on the occasion of a funeral in London. Lord Noel [2] and Richard Crashaw, the poet, are among them." [3]

The 1645-47 volume of the *Calendar of State Papers,* Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I [4] (p. 467) contains a letter from Queen Henrietta Maria to Pope Innocent X, written from St. Germain-en-Laye, Paris, August 28, 1646:

"The Sieur Crashou [Crashaw?] having been a minister in England . . . This has induced me upon his present departure for Rome . . ."

From this one would infer that Crashaw had been an Anglican minister in England, and, since the Queen was writing late in August 1646, that he went to Rome earlier than we have believed, heretofore.[5]

The publications of the Historical MSS. Commission offer further proof of contemporary appreciation of Crashaw as a poet. With the MSS. of Sir Geo. Wombwell (Vol. 69, Var. Coll. 2) are bound papers from the family Belasyse. The MS. of *An English Traveler's*

[1] Tenth Report, Appendix, Part VI—the MSS. of Lord Braye and others, 1887.

[2] Probably Lord Edward Noel of Ridlington (1582-1643). His heir married the second daughter of Crashaw's patroness, the Countess of Denbigh, to whom Crashaw addresses the first poem in *Carmen Deo Nostro.*

[3] This offers further proof of Crashaw's precocity as a poet; cf. *Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit.,* VII, 37, for evidence of his birth in 1612.

[4] Ed. William Douglas Hamilton, F. S. A., London, 1891.

[5] *Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit.* (VII, 40) makes no mention of the Queen's communication with the Pope or of the date of Crashaw's departure for Rome. According to *D. N. B.* he went to Rome in 1648-9.

First Curiosity, or The Knowledge of his owne Country, by Henry B[elasyse], 1657, April, reads:

"What nation can shew more refined witts then those of our Ben, our Shakespeare, our Baumont, our Fletcher, our Dunn, our Randol, our Crashaw, our Cleveland, our Sidney, our Bacon, etc."

In the volume *Mss. of the Earl of Egmont,*[6] we find a letter of Robert Southwell, dated Rome, December 23, 1660,[7] in which he speaks of someone telling him about the life and death of "your famous Cambridge wit, Crasshaw."

Burton Confrey.

University of Notre Dame, Ind.

BRIEF MENTION

Swift. Swiftly, and their Synonyms: A Contribution to Semantic Analysis and Theory, by Gustaf Stern (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, 1921, III. Göteborg, Wettergren & Kerber. 295 pp.). The semantic study of the group of words indicated by the title is here reported in almost bewildering detail. The study of these words is restricted to the Old and Middle English periods, with the exclusion of French and Scandinavian loanwords; and the native words studied are those "denoting speed in relation to action," not "those denoting speed in relation to time only." In an introductory chapter are expounded the principles of semasiology and the methods to be employed in eliciting trustworthy results. Two branches of the science are to be distinguished, "one of them treating the meanings of words as objective thoughts. that is to say, with regard to their logical import; the other dealing with the psychic acts involved." It is the logical branch that has received the greater share of attention "because of its importance for lexicography and etymology"; the psychological branch has remained in the less developed and technical "borderland between philology and psychology."

Three-fourths of the book (pp. 17-201) are embraced in the second chapter, entitled "Sense-development of the Individual Words." A grouping of the words studied determines the subdivisions of the chapter, as follows: "Group I. Words in which the sense of speed is primary." Here are treated OE. *hræd, hrædlic hrædlice; (h)rape; swift, swifte, swiftlice; snel, snelle; leoht, leohtlic, leohtlice.* "Group II. Words originally signifying 'strong.'" These are OE. *fæste,* adv., *fæst,* adj., *fæstlice,* adj.

[6] *Hist. Mss. Comm.*, vol. 53, Earl of Egmont, vol. I, part II, London, 1905, p. 616.

[7] This letter is cited for another purpose in *N. & Q.* XI, II, 205.

(taken in this order); *swiþe* adv., *swiþ,* adj. "Group III. Words originally signifying 'sharp.'" These are OE. *scearp,* adj., *scearplice,* adv.; ME. *smart,* adj., *smartly,* adv., *smart,* adv.; OE. *hwæt, hwætlice,* ME. *hwæte,* adv. "Group IV. Words originally signifying 'living.'" Here are OE. *cwic,* adj., ME. *quickly,* adv., *quick,* adv.; OE. *liflic,* adj., ME. *lively,* adv. "Group V. Words originally signifying 'eagerly.'" Only one word, OE. *georne,* adv., is found here. It is observed that *georn, -lice, -ful,* and *-fullice* "did not acquire the sense of speed." "Group VI. Words originally signifying 'clever.'" These are OE. *geap,* adj., *geaplice,* adv.; ME. *spack,* adj. (a Scand. loanword), *spackly,* adv. "Group VII. Words originally signifying 'ready.'" These are OE. *gearu,* adj., *gearwe,* adv.; OE. *geræde,* ME. *redi,* adj., *redily,* adv.

The foregoing indication of the contents of this extended chapter must awaken interest in the method of investigation and the analysis of meanings to which each word is subjected. A basis for the minute classification of the meanings of a word is deduced from OE. and ME. citations, which are so ample as to acquire a recognizable value in the interpretation of texts. That all these citations have been placed in the indisputably right division of meanings cannot be expected, but at no point does one get the impression that Dr. Stern has at times relied on a hasty judgment. As to the 'exhibits' in this chapter, the description of the 'groups' indicates that the usage of each word is traced from its assumed basic meaning (for example, *gearu* is defined as at first signifying passively "a state of readiness or completion") thru a course of changes or modifications until it comes to mean 'promptly,' 'soon,' some aspect of 'speed,' synonymous with 'swift.'

The logic of sense-development is then considered in the following chapter, in an attempt to deduce, from "a comparison of similar developments in different words," the logical principles underlying all the sense-changes recorded. No summary of this chapter shall be attempted, but it is to be observed that the adverbs are an especially effective category in acquiring new meanings and in turning them back upon the adjectives. A result is also reached, which, it is declared, "may perhaps be applied to other groups of words as well"; it is this "that, though many words of *originally* widely different significations acquire the sense of rapidity, they do not do so till after having acquired a meaning which is essentially similar in all of them. From this meaning they all pass through a development of similar nature, resulting in the sense of rapidity."

The two concluding chapters are devoted to the psychological aspect of sense-change and the classification of sense-changes. The topics first discussed are (1) Definition of meaning; (2) Psychic constituents of meaning; (3) Relation between thought and speech, for the speaker; (4) Relation between thought and speech, for the

hearer; (5) Relation between thought as producing speech, and thought as produced by the same speech. "Considering the fact that most words have many significations, the identity of the speaker's thoughts with the thoughts actually called up by his words in the hearer's mind is by no means a matter of course. In fact, this identity is probably never absolute." (6) Fluctuation of meaning; (7) Oscillation of meaning. In the expression 'he went quickly out of the room,' "we may assume the meaning of the adverb to oscillate between 'rapidly' and 'immediately.'" (8) The process of change. From the foregoing definitions of meaning and of sentence it is now affirmed "that a sense-change implies (for a person speaking, or writing) that a word is associated with a partial conception not identical with those with which it has previously been associated. If the association between the word and the new conception grows habitual, we say that the word has acquired a new shade of sense." (9) 'Irregular' factors of sense-change. Here cultural factors are observed as "in translations and in works of an ecclesiastical or religious character, which are often dependent on Latin sources" (p. 246). Thus, *leoht slæp,* in Bede, renders *levis somnus* (p. 52). (10) Vagueness of images (conceptions). The behaviorist might notice this expression: "Whatever opinion one may have of the theory that thought is possible without images, one thing is universally admitted: that the mental state corresponding to a word (*i. e.* the conceptions which constitute its meaning) is often extremely indistinct. . . . We pay just enough attention to it to enable us to apprehend what it represents, and its connexion with the total meaning, and then pass on to the next word of the sentence" (James and Erdmann are referred to). (11) Association with synonyms; (12) Set phrases. Influence of change in governing words; (13) "Finally, . . . conservative influences, that to a certain extent counterbalance the forces which favour sense-changes."

In the final "Psychological classification of sense-changes," the entire collection of material is re-considered under three headings: (A) Cumulative sense-change (29 sub-divisions); (B) Sense-transfers: (1) Transfer from one material object or action to another; (2) Transfer of a quality from a material object to a living being, its faculties, mood, character, etc.; (3) Synaesthesia. Notice Oertel, p. 327 f.: "The phenomenon of synaesthesia has received rather full treatment at the hand of psychologists, but its reflection in language has not yet received adequate treatment by lexicographers." Dr. Stern, p. 131, has this and other references. (4) Transfer of a quality from material to immaterial objects or actions; (5) Figurative senses. (B) Sense-loans: (1) from foreign sources; (2) from cognate English words.

A first reading of this treatise has resulted in the conviction that a restatement of the table of its contents will serve to bring it to the notice of the competent reader in a better way than would have been done by a discussion of some selected details. What is thus shown, it will be acknowledged, is that the author has with fine discernment chosen a group of words to serve as a basis for a study in semantics. It will also be inferred that there is considerable excess in the elaboration of minute analyses and subclassifications. This is to the credit of the author's conscientious sense of thoroness, but it also betrays an incomplete control of the processes of valid combination and generalization. The long lists of "works quoted" and "texts read," with the evidence thruout the treatise that these sources have been well scrutinized, confirm the judgment that Dr. Stern has made a worthy and substantial contribution to this class of investigations.

At some points, clearly set forth, Dr. Stern finds it impossible to accept without modification the semantic principles deduced by previous investigators, and he admits that the material he has brought together is not adequate for altogether clearing up these principles. He concludes that "no satisfactory system of psychological classification has been established, nor is there any general consensus of opinion regarding the fundamental principles of such a system. . . . Much additional research is necessary before it will be possible to gain a comprehensive view of the whole field of semasiology."

As a proof at once of the instructiveness and of the general neglect of this subject, one may safely assume that few speakers or writers have ever thought of how the *underscored* words in 'I should *rather* (or *sooner*) do this *than* that' have come to have the meaning shown in that sentence.

J. W. B.

Philological Quarterly. A Journal devoted to Scholarly Investigation in the Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures. Vol. 1, no. 1, January 1922 (Published at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa). The editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes* extend the heartiest welcome to this new periodical. Under the competent editorial management of Professor Hardin Craig, its scholarly character is abundantly assured; and the coöperation of the chosen associate editors, Professors Charles Bundy Wilson, B. L. Ullman, Thomas A. Knott, and Charles E. Young, strongly ratify that assurance. The uniting of Classical with Modern Language studies has a fresh significance at this time. This will enable the new periodical to assume the attractive and no less important

function of expounding and contributing to the illumination of one of the principal chapters in present-day educational and cultural problems. J. W. B.

It is rather remarkable that the complete correspondence between Swift and Hester Van Homrigh should not have been published till the present year when Mr. A. Martin Freeman edited it from the original manuscripts in the British Museum under the title, *Vanessa and Her Correspondence with Jonathan Swift* (Houghton Mifflin Company). Most of these letters had appeared consecutively for the first time in the Scott edition in 1814. Now by Mr. Freeman's careful study of the originals and especially through his discovery of the endorsements in Vanessa's handwriting a more accurate arrangement of the letters has been arrived at and some idea of those known to be missing can be determined. There is still a good deal left to conjecture in the matter of dates and allusions, but the best use has been made of the materials to hand. Two letters appear now for the first time besides a little note and a postscript. Vanessa endorsed each letter with a number to indicate its place in a chronological order and the collection was divided into seven groups, though what the significance of these groups may be is not clear. Included in the volume are *Cadenus and Vanessa* and other poems and documents as well as some letters in the MSS. volume that have nothing to do with Vanessa.

Probably the opinion of the world will not be altered by the new review of this celebrated case which Mr. Freeman makes in the light of the originals. The story of the final meeting between the two is dismissed with justice into the limbo of painful and malicious gossip. We see Swift floundering along "with a blindness which only our knowledge of his intense sincerity enables us to credit" in a vain effort to cure of her infatuation a woman for whom he had no cure that he felt he could offer; we have more pity than indignation for him and the deepest sorrow for her. They were both caught in a net and neither could escape till death cut the knots. Mr. Freeman's presentation of the case is both wise and just.

J. W. T.

Father Tabb, His Life and Work: A Memorial. By His Niece, Jennie Masters Tabb. Introduction by Dr. Charles Alphonso Smith (Boston, The Stratford Co., 1921). Miss Tabb's book is an acceptable contribution to American literary biography, principally because it deals with a poet about whom not much is known. It contains the most detailed account at present accessible of the life of the poet-priest, and in this respect is superior to M. S. Pine's book (*John Bannister Tabb, The Priest-Poet,*

Georgetown Visitation Convent, Washington, D. C., 1915), now out of print. Altho Miss Tabb has given more personal information about her uncle than M. S. Pine, she has been almost wholly dependent for her material on friends of the poet, such as Mr. Turnbull, of Baltimore, and Fathers Magri, Perrig, and Connor. Nor has she attempted any literary criticism, being satisfied to reproduce from various unnamed periodicals the opinions of unknown reviewers. However, she has quoted extensively from his published work, to the extent of at least sixty pages. The effect of reading thru all these quotations is the impression that the book is merely a compilation of valuable material that has not been well used.

Like M. S. Pine, Miss Tabb has had to face the problem of writing the life of a man whom she did not know intimately. Her book, therefore, also fails to give either an accurate or a complete account of the poet's life, and repeats many errors. As I have carefully investigated the many misstatements and incorrect dates that have been accepted without question by those who have written about Father Tabb, I shall note a few of the inaccuracies found in the two writers, without at present correcting them or proving my statements.

(1) Both M. S. Pine and Miss Tabb use the spelling Bannister; Banister is correct.

(2) The only date besides 1870 given by Miss Tabb between the year of the poet's release from Point Lookout and that of his ordination is 1874 (p. 25). But he did not enter St. Charles' College in that year. M. S. Pine makes the same mistake (p. 27).

(3) Both M. S. Pine (p. 45) and Miss Tabb (p. 36) state that his first volume of poems was published in 1884. (*The Camb. Hist. Am. Lit.,* Vol. II, p. 604 gives the date 1883.) Neither date is correct.

(4) Miss Tabb (p. 96), following W. Hand Browne (*Library of Southern Literature,* Vol. XII, p. 5176), includes *Dusk* as an unpublished piece among a small collection of poems first printed by Browne. This particular poem, however, had been published in the unique volume called *Two Lyrics* in 1900. Moreover, this volume is unknown, apparently, to both writers.

(5) The longest poem that Father Tabb ever wrote, *The Ruin,* the loss of which Miss Tabb, quoting Father Perrig (p. 79) laments, has been preserved in a valuable collection containing about seventy-five unpublished manuscripts which I was fortunate enough to discover recently in Baltimore.

I may add that it is my intention to publish within a year a *Critical Study of the Life and Works of Father Tabb, with a Collection of Unpublished Poems.* F. A. L.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVII MAY, 1922 NUMBER 5

SCHILLER AND ROMANTICISM

Professor Lovejoy's notice [1] of my volume *Rousseau and Romanticism* reveals fundamental differences of opinion regarding Schiller and his relation to the romantic movement. In the introduction to this volume I remark that my method is open in certain respects to grave misunderstanding.[2] Professor Lovejoy has, however, surpassed anything I had anticipated. In ingenious and complicated misapprehension of my point of view he has easily outdone all my other reviewers. In order to understand the difference between Professor Lovejoy and myself regarding Schiller it will be necessary to clear away certain of his misapprehensions. In the first place, I do not, as Professor Lovejoy affirms, identify romanticism with Rousseauism; on the contrary I give the name of Rousseauism only to emotional romanticism—one of the three main types of romanticism that I am at pains to distinguish. Even here I put my chief emphasis on Rousseau because he is on the whole the most significant figure in this movement and not because he is its originator. On the contrary, I assert that considered purely as an originator Shaftesbury [3] is perhaps more important than Rousseau—a fact that bears on our present topic because of the influence direct or indirect of Shaftesbury on various Germans of the eighteenth century including Schiller.[4] I am concerned for the most part with only one main aspect of emotional

[1] See *Modern Language Notes*, May, 1920, p. 302 ff.

[2] *Rousseau and Romanticism*, p. xvi.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[4] See article by A. L. Carter on "Schiller and Shaftesbury," *International Journal of Ethics*, Jan., 1921.

romanticism itself, namely its ethical or pseudo-ethical pretensions, its attempt to set up as a philosophy of life or even as a religion. What I have tried to do is to trace this ethical or pseudo-ethical aspect of the movement in the life and literature of the past hundred years or more. It is quite beside the mark to say, as Professor Lovejoy says, that I have "attained the distinction of having damned perhaps a larger number of eminent and long-accepted writers than any other modern critic," for, as I am careful to indicate,[5] I am not attempting rounded estimates of individuals. Forget this distinction and it is easy enough to present me as a sort of fanatic running amuck through the art and literature of the last two hundred years and giving the impression, as Professor Lovejoy says, that most of it "ought never to have been written." But I am not engaging in any wholesale condemnation of either the eighteenth or the nineteenth century. It is even less sensible perhaps to indict a whole century than it is according to Burke to indict a whole people. If I had attempted anything of the kind, Professor Lovejoy would be justified in his charge that I am not a humanist but an extremist. In my study of emotional romanticism in its relation to ethics the question that arises is not the humanistic question at all, namely the question of mediation, but a question of truth or error. The man who mediates with reference to error is not a humanist but a Laodicean.

It might also be well to say that I am not setting up a philosophy of history. A book that has been attracting a good deal of attention of late in Germany, Oswald Spengler's "Downfall of the Occident,"[6] develops a thesis that has certain superficial points of contact with my own. According to Spengler, the whole of the Occident is now engaged in a sort of rake's progress, which starts with Rousseau and his return to nature. Spengler believes that it is not only possible to establish fatal curves for the great "cultures" of the past but that these curves may be extended into the future. He actually has a table exhibiting the degree of degeneracy that the Occident will have attained by the year 2000. The whole conception not only implies a phi-

[5] *Rousseau and Romanticism*, p. xvii.

[6] *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* von Oswald Spengler (1918). This book, which contains over 600 closely printed pages of heavy philosophical generalization, is said to have had a sale of more than 50,000 copies!

losophy of history, but a philosophy of history that has in my judgment gone mad. My own primary emphasis is on something that Spengler eliminates entirely, namely the free moral choices of individuals and the fruits of these choices in life and conduct. My chief interest in short is in the problem of the will. All other aspects of emotional romanticism seem to me of small moment as compared with its relation to this problem. My own view of the will has much in common with the Christian view or with the view that is implied in Aristotle's treatment of habit in the Nicomachean Ethics. What is specifically human in man is, I affirm, the power to pull back his impulses with reference to some model set above his ordinary self. That Professor Lovejoy should assimilate my sharply dualistic position, my insistence on the full Pauline contrast between a law of the spirit and a law of the members, with that of the aesthetic and pantheistic Schelling, suggests, so far as it suggests anything, the futility of trying to convey thought by means of words at all.

> Let the long contention cease!
> Geese are swans and swans are geese.

Now it is possible to trace with the utmost accuracy the process by which the Christian and Aristotelian dualism gave place in the course of the eighteenth century to naturalistic tendencies. This naturalistic trend appears most clearly perhaps in the transformation at this time of such words as virtue and conscience.[7] Instead of being a power of control over the natural man in general and the emotions in particular, conscience becomes itself an expansive emotion—or, in Rousseau's own phrase not a "judgment," as it had been traditionally, but a "sentiment."[8] "Si c'est la raison qui fait l'homme, c'est le sentiment qui le conduit."

We need be in no doubt as to Schiller's position regarding the guiding element in man since he has taken this very sentence of Rousseau as the motto of his *Aesthetic Letters*. It is a commonplace of criticism that he turned to emotion as an escape from what seemed to him the Draconian severity of Kant's assertion of the moral law, the stoical hardness and angularity of the Kantian

[7] See my paper on "Rousseau and Conscience" in *Journal of Philosophy*, 25 March, 1920, p. 186 ff.

[8] *Nouvelle Héloïse*, Pt. VI, Lettre VII.

rationalism.[9] Schiller makes many more reservations than Rousseau, but in thus trusting the emotions he is led in no small degree to trust the natural man and his supposed goodness. He finally arrives like Rousseau at the conception of the "beautiful soul."[10] the person who does right instinctively and without a trace of the inner struggle or "civil war in the cave" on which both the Christian and the classical dualist put so much emphasis.

The person who is at one with himself and is spontaneously good and beautiful has much in common with the person who is at one with nature and is spontaneously poetical. This brings us to the treatise of Schiller that led directly to the rise of a romantic school, that *On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry*. According to Schiller's familiar distinction the naïve poet *is* nature, whereas the poet who has fallen from nature and looks back to it longingly from the artificialities of an advanced civilization is sentimental. I hardly need recall that this whole distinction is rapidly becoming obsolete. It is not simply that we refuse to see in Homer a naïve poet and in Horace the founder of the sentimental school "of which he still remains an unsurpassed model."[11] but that we are rejecting more and more the whole contrast between a Naturpoesie and a Kunstpoesie, at least in anything like the form in which Schiller and other Rousseauistic primitivists established it.

But, replies Professor Lovejoy, Schiller would not have us return to nature in Rousseau's sense, but would have us struggle forward to an Elysium. "The goal towards which man strives through culture (*Kultur*) is infinitely to be preferred to the goal to which he attains through nature."[12] This, says Professor Lovejoy, is Schiller's epoch-making conclusion. "Mr. Babbitt has apparently missed the significance of the writing which is perhaps the most decisive single turning-point in the history with which his book is concerned." The German romanticists are certainly more friendly to "culture," at least in the sense that they are more

[9] For Schiller's own account of the matter, see *Über Anmuth und Würde*, x, 101 (References are to the Goedeke edition.)

[10] For what one may term the standard definition of the beautiful soul in Germany, see *ibid.*, x, 103.

[11] x, 446.

[12] x, 453. The Goedeke edition has *Kultur* instead of *Natur*, a misprint that makes the sentence meaningless.

friendly to the intellect and its activity, than some of the Stürmer and Dränger. If they are less inclined to say with Rousseau that "the man who reflects is a depraved animal," the influence may be due in some measure to Schiller. But the real question raised by this movement, let me repeat, is even less primitivism of the intellect than primitivism of the will. In the Elysium to which Schiller would have us press forward as well as in the "state of nature" to which Rousseau looks back with longing the escape from man's present disharmony is conceived expansively.[13] What underlies this substitution of emotional expansion for a concentration of the will is, as I have tried to show in my volume, something still more central in romantic psychology, namely the problem of the imagination. Professor Lovejoy has devoted a large part of his review to developing the thesis that I am myself only a belated romanticist attacking his own kind. My stupidity is of much the same order apparently as that of the fabled beast of antiquity that devoured his own paws. Now I admit that I have at least this much in common with the romanticists that I assign a supremely important rôle to the imagination, that I grant the truth of the Napoleonic dictum that "imagination governs the world." My whole book is devoted, however, to distinguishing between different types of imagination, especially between what I term the Arcadian or idyllic imagination on the one hand, and the ethical or centripetal imagination on the other. The Arcadian imagination parts company with reality entirely, the ethical imagination is disciplined to a reality, or if one prefers, a law distinct

[13] For a good example of primitivism of the will see the poem *Die Würde der Frauen* (1795). The corrective of man's expansive energy is not a power of control or ethical will in man himself, but woman conceived as an embodiment of the naïve and childlike virtues, of spontaneous gentleness and sympathy. Perhaps the most extreme instance of primitivism of the will in Schiller dates from the same rather late period in his life:

"Suchst du das Höchste, das Grösste? Die Pflanze kann es dich lehren.
Was sie Willenlos ist, sey du es wollend—das ists!"

It is hardly necessary to dilate on the sheer expansiveness of the youthful Schiller, who alone exercised an important direct influence on the European movement through *Die Räuber*. A "liberty" that explodes against the restraints of the existing social order is to be tempered, not by some new principle of selection and control, but by a sympathy that is ready to bestow "a kiss on the whole world."

from that of the natural order. Professor Lovejoy accuses me of misrepresenting Schiller, and yet has published what purports to be a review of my book in which he says practically nothing of this, my main distinction.

Schiller says that "he too was born in Arcadia." The question I raise is whether, so far as the ultimate quality of his imagination is concerned, he ever got out of Arcadia. As to his theory of the imagination it seems to me that no doubt is possible. He not only proclaims the idyll the highest form of art but the Elysium to which he invites us is like Rousseau's state of nature, plainly idyllic. To indulge this type of imagination is to escape from ordinary reality without achieving a higher reality; it is to fall into mere nostalgia, the infinite indeterminate longing of the romantic heart. Here is the source of the contrast between the ideal and the real, between poetry and life that is all-pervasive in this movement. As the romantic imagination soars into its own "intense inane"

des Erdenlebens
Schweres Traumbild sinkt und sinkt und sinkt.

This straining of the imagination away from an unpalatable reality towards something that has never existed and never can exist is especially manifest in a poem like *The Gods of Greece,* a main source of what one may term romantic Hellenism. One may see in Hölderlin, a follower of both Schiller and Rousseau, the transformation of the classical ideal not merely into a nostalgia but a mortal nostalgia.[14] It is in part due to the influence of Schiller that the Greek spirit itself has become, in Walter Pater's phrase, the Sangrail of an endless pilgrimage.

Schiller's Greece is not only unreal, a mere aesthetic land of heart's desire, but, in general, beauty, as he conceives it, is reduced to a world of appearance (Schein), a "realm of shadows" without substantive reality in either the naturalistic or the humanistic sense. The relation between this Reich der Schatten[15] and Rousseau's "Pays des chimères" (later to become the Ivory Tower) is evident.

[14] Mich verlangt ins ferne Land hinüber
Nach Alcäus und Anakreon, etc.

[15] Fliehet aus dem engen dumpfen Leben
In der Schönheit Schattenreich!

On the surface, Schiller's point of view seems highly favorable to the Greeks, conceived as at one with "nature" in Rousseau's sense, and to "naïve" people in general. But the sentimental poet who was later to become with some modifications the romantic poet has an advantage in what appears at first sight to be his weakness: he is filled with aspiration. He longs for example to be like the Greek, but the Greek himself did not long. The sentimental poet has in short something that the Greek poet lacked,—the sense of infinitude. Schiller not only associates the infinite with the escape from limitations but regards such an escape as desirable. To be sure, the meaning of the word infinite is none too clear. Professor Lovejoy distinguishes five meanings of the word infinite in the early stages of German romanticism and attributes to this looseness of usage much of the later confusion as to the meaning of the word romantic.[16] But it will be noted that all the infinites that Professor Lovejoy enumerates are infinites of expansion. Now Aristotle says that the infinite conceived in this purely expansive way is bad.[17] I not only accept this Aristotelian dictum but distinguish in opposition to the infinite of expansion an infinite of concentration. What is truly central in human experience, however incapable it may be of final formulation in terms of the intellect, may be seized with the aid of the imagination and supplies a standard with reference to which a man may impose control upon his ordinary self: to impose this control upon the natural man is to work in the humanistic sense. To select an adequate human end and then to work towards it imaginatively is to display, whether in art or life, genuine freedom. The presence of the imagination that co-operates with the reason in the service of the ethical will, is felt even less in the details of a work of art than in its general structure and design: so that one may call the type of imagination present in the best art, the architec-

[16] *Modern Language Notes*, March, 1920, p. 141.

[17] *Eth. Nich.* II, vi, 14. For the "infinite" in this sense cf. also Nietzsche: "*Proportionateness* is strange to us, let us confess it to ourselves; our itching is really the itching for the infinite, the immeasurable. Like the rider on his forward panting horse, we let the reins fall before the infinite, we modern men, we semi-barbarians—and are only in *our* highest bliss when we—*are in most danger*." (*Beyond Good and Evil*, translated by Helen Zimmern, p. 169-70.)

tonic imagination. The art that has this imaginative quality is in the Aristotelian sense "highly serious." The wideness of the gap between my own Aristotelian point of view and that of Schiller is revealed by the fact that for him the architectonic element in the work of art is the result, not of man's responsible choices, but of natural necessity.[18] Man shows his freedom, according to Schiller, not by work in any sense of the word but by play,—a form of play that involves an even more complete emancipation from concentration and purpose than is found in Kant's *Critique of Aesthetic Judgment* from which Schiller's theories so largely derive. The impulse to play (Spieltrieb), says Schiller, unites the two natures of man, a union that is achieved, according to the humanist, by the effort of the ethical will. "Der Mensch ist nur da ganz Mensch, wo er spielt."[19] Here is a clear-cut assertion that calls for equally clear-cut acceptance or rejection. Reject it and the whole structure of Schiller's aesthetic theory crumbles at the base.[20]

Schiller's emancipation of the imagination from purpose and reality and at the same time his setting up of sentiment or expansive emotion as the guiding element in man, culminating in the notion that man is completely human only when he is engaged in free aesthetic play, leads, I assert, to a decadent aestheticism. It is this assertion that has especially scandalized Professor Lovejoy. Yet it is not difficult to show that the substitution of the Schillerian conception of "play" for the Aristotelian conception of work according to the human law encourages the exaltation of indolence, the romantic gospel of a "wise passiveness." The Grecks, says Schiller himself, "freed the eternally blessed gods from the bonds

[18] *Über Anmuth und Würde*, x, 70.

[19] *Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*, x, 327.

[20] Since writing my volume, I have read the work of Victor Basch: *La Poétique de Schiller*, 2e éd. 1911. Though holding a conception of criticism very different from my own, he arrives at about the same conclusions regarding Schiller's influence on the German romanticists (see p. 324 ff.) He grants, however, rather more than I do to Schiller and rather less to Fichte in the formation of the phenomenon known as romantic irony. His total judgment on Schiller as an aesthetic theorist is as follows (p. 348): "En définitive, nous croyons que ni la méthode, ni les prémisses, ni les conclusions de la poétique de Schiller ne sont vraiment valables."

of every aim, every duty, and every care, and made idleness (Müssiggang) and indifference the envied lot of the divine estate: a purely human name for the freest and most exalted being." [21] The relation between such passages and Friedrich Schlegel's *Idylle über den Müssiggang* can scarcely escape any one; and if this chapter of *Lucinde* is not a bit of decadent aestheticism the phrase has no meaning.[22]

The desire of Schiller to escape from the unduly didactic trend of the neo-classic school and from the utilitarianism of the "Enlightenment," was in itself perfectly legitimate. Unfortunately he repudiated the didactic and utilitarian error only to fall into an aestheticism that opened the way for the later fallacies of *l'art pour l'art*. Instead of affirming a possible co-operation of imagination and reason in the service of the force in man that I have termed the ethical will, he sets up expansive emotion as a substitute for will and establishes an opposition between reason and imagination even more acute than that of which I complain in the neo-classicist. One will never achieve on Schillerian lines the imaginative reason that Matthew Arnold discovers in the best Greek poets. "In aesthetic judgments," says Schiller, "our interest is not in morality for itself but only in freedom, and morality can please our imagination only in so far as it makes freedom visible. Hence there is manifest confusion of the boundaries when one demands moral purpose in aesthetic things and, in order to widen the realm of reason, seeks to force the imagination out of its proper domain. Imagination will either have to be subjected entirely to reason and in that case all aesthetic effect is lost, or reason will have to yield a part of its sovereignty to imagination, and in that case there is no great gain for morality. As a result of pursuing two different ends, you will run the risk of missing both. You will chain the freedom of phantasy through moral restrictions and disturb the necessity of reason through the caprice (Willkühr) of imagination." [23]

The relation between this passage and other passages of Schiller I have been quoting and romantic psychology is in a general way obvious. It was no part of the plan of my book to write a detailed

[21] *Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*, x, 328.

[22] For Novalis and Schiller, see Haym, *Romantische Schule*, p. 376.

[23] *Vom Erhabenen*, x, p. 176, line 29 ff.

history of romanticism as a European movement, or of the connection between Schiller and the German romantics in particular. I have, as a matter of fact, given only a fraction of the material I myself have accumulated on this latter point. My volume does not compete on their own ground with the investigations of Haym, or Enders, or Rouge, or Professor Lovejoy himself. The influence of Schiller on Friedrich Schlegel is difficult to elucidate in detail. This difficulty is in part due to a certain looseness in Schiller's use of such words as nature,[24] partly to the fact that his main comparison (that between the "naïve" in the Rousseauistic sense and the "sentimental") is between two things one of which never existed, and finally to the fact that Friedrich Schlegel is an unusually confused and vacillating thinker.[25] Still the relationship between the ideas of Schiller and those of Friedrich Schlegel is in its broad lines scarcely open to question. After exalting the classicism of the Greeks, a classicism into which enters a strong element of Schiller's naïveté, Schlegel finally secedes to the romantic point of view (related to the "sentimental" attitude) because of its superiority on the side of the "infinite." One can even explain on Schillerian grounds the glorification by Schlegel and other romanticists, of the middle ages as the acme of romanticism. They seem to find in the middle ages what Schiller had required:[26] it was a period at once naïve and infinitely aspiring.

When one brushes aside the charges of inaccuracy and misrepresentation of Schiller that Professor Lovejoy brings against me and fails to substantiate, and gets at the essence of the difference between us, one finds that it is philosophical—the difference namely between an Aristotelian realism and an idealism that so far as it reveals itself in this review has a highly Teutonic flavor. This difference goes so deep that a full discussion of it would be beyond the scope of *Modern Language Notes*. A word however should be said about the significance of the play-theory of art for the critic and teacher of literature. If one traces back this theory from Schiller to Kant's *Critique of Aesthetic Judgment*, and from

[24] Cf. Basch, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

[25] In November, 1797, Friedrich wrote to his brother Wilhelm: "Meine Erklärung des Worts romantisch kann ich Dir nicht gut schicken, weil sie—125 Bogen lang ist!" Cf. Haym, *Romantische Schule*, 803 (note).

[26] *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung*, x, 509.

Kant to the English writers [27] by whom Kant was largely influenced, one finds that the ideas that led to the theory developed in close connection with the English utilitarian tradition. The germs of it are indeed to be found in Bacon himself.[28] If one follows down the play-theory in England one finally comes to Herbert Spencer's well-known exposition of it in his Psychology. The animus of the whole movement is revealed in Spencer who exalts physical science and the scientific investigation of nature to the first place at the same time that he reduces art and literature to a secondary and merely recreative rôle. Schiller has defined admirably and attacked what we should call nowadays the point of view of the tired business man.[29] But the play-theory, being as it is in intimate alliance with the whole utilitarian conception, favors the tired business man. Only when the artist or writer displays a concentration and virile effort entirely different from that of the man of science does he rise above the recreative level and achieve high seriousness. The imagination of Dante for example was not playing in the Kantian or Schillerian sense but working in the Aristotelian sense when he wrote the *Divine Comedy*. For the teacher of literature in particular to lose sight of a distinction of this kind is suicidal. He will be forced into a position subordinate to the utilitarian, as indeed is more or less the case already, and will be fortunate if he is not finally eliminated entirely. One should indeed recollect that there are many grades of artistic and literary excellence short of the highest. Poems of Schiller like *Das Reich der Schatten* and *Die Götter Griechenlands* are not only successful in their own way but extraordinarily suc-

[27] Many of these English sources are indicated in the edition of the *Critique of Aesthetic Judgment* by J. C. Meredith (1911).

[28] See *Advancement of Learning*, Bk. II: "The use of this feigned history (i. e. poetry) hath been to give some shadow of satisfaction to the mind of man in those points wherein the nature of things doth deny it . . . it doth raise and erect the mind, by submitting the shows of things to the desires of the mind, whereas reason doth buckle and bow the mind unto the nature of things." This passage seems to be a first adumbration of the later view that the scientific observer is to submit to the discipline of reality, whereas the poet is to feel more or less free to shatter this sorry scheme of things and "then remould it nearer to the heart's desire," to indulge in other words the romantic type of imagination.

[29] *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung*, X, 506. He has the actual phrase (den erschöpften Geschäftsmann).

cessful; they are the translation into genuine poetry of difficult philosophical abstractions. Yet the usual romantic confusion is not entirely absent from these poems—that of putting forth as a wise view of life what is at bottom a mere nostalgia. One's final rating of Schiller's or any poetry should at all events be based primarily on the quality of the imagination displayed and not primarily on its technique or outer form and still less on its explicit moralizing. A work may be, like Chateaubriand's *René*, a masterpiece of technique, it may end with a very edifying sermon like that of Père Souël, and yet in its essence be thoroughly unethical; and that is because it is, in its ultimate imaginative quality, an extreme example of emotional romanticism. The insertion of *René* in the *Genius of Christianity* was therefore rightly felt at the time to be highly incongruous. This at all events is the issue between Professor Lovejoy and myself. If the treatise that Professor Lovejoy takes to mark the most decisive single turning point in the history of the romantic movement, seems to me much less important, the reason is, as I have already said, that the "culture" or Elysium to which Schiller would have us press forward has so much in common imaginatively with the "nature" or Arcadia of Rousseau; it is still aesthetic and idyllic.

Irving Babbitt.

Harvard University.

REPLY TO PROFESSOR BABBITT

I. Professor Babbitt attributes to me several "misapprehensions" of his meaning. An author alone knows his own intent; a reviewer can but judge by his words. In Mr. Babbitt's reply I note with satisfaction some modification of his previous statement of his position. I find no evidence that the review misrepresented the opinions expressed in the book.

1. Mr. Babbitt disclaims "identifying romanticism with Rousseauism." The latter is only one of three types of romanticism; and of this type Rousseau was not the first but only the most significant representative.—If Mr. Babbitt had honored my review with a more careful reading, he would have seen that he is here replying to a criticism which I did not make. My objection to

the assumption that "Rousseauism and romanticism are essentially one" was not based upon the view that Rousseau represented one, but only one, species of romanticism, or that there were others before him; nor did I charge the author with denying this. What I asserted was that "the preconceptions and tendencies most characteristic of Rousseau" were actually "*antithetic* to romanticism"—at least if we are to use the term "with any historical precision and in a sense applicable to the doctrines of those writers who were the first to call their own ideals 'romantic'"; and that Mr. Babbitt failed "to make clear the profound distinction between these two complexes of ideas." To this actual criticism no reply is made. The point is important, and I hope shortly to deal with it at length elsewhere.

2. Mr. Babbitt declares that he has not engaged "in any wholesale condemnation of either the eighteenth or nineteenth century"; that it would, indeed, be foolish "to indict a whole century."—I cite three (wholly typical) sentences from his book: "It is hard to avoid concluding that we are living in a world that has gone wrong on first principles" (367). "If I am right in my conviction as to the unsoundness of a Rousseauistic philosophy of life, it follows that *the total tendency of the Occident at present* is away from rather than towards civilization" (x). "Modern philosophy is bankrupt, not only from Kant, but from Descartes" (xvi).

3. Mr. Babbitt disclaims attempting to pass general judgments on any writers; he has dealt merely with a single aspect of the thought or art of those whom he mentions.—It is true that his introduction contained such a disclaimer. But does the disclaimer accord with the actual contents of the book? Let me cite, in answer, another sentence, which states the conclusion of a long discussion: "Possibly no age ever had so many dubious moralists as this, an incomparable series of false prophets from Rousseau himself down to Nietzsche and Tolstoy" (352). To call a man a "dubious moralist" and a "false prophet" is, it will hardly be denied, to give an unfavorable summing-up on his work and influence. And this Mr. Babbitt does in his book for a long line of great writers of the past two centuries, who are exhibited as contributing, through their most characteristic ideas or their most important writings, to a "stream of emotional sophistry," the total outcome of which is represented as profoundly evil.

4. Mr. Babbitt's chief complaint of his critic seems to be that his own "sharply dualistic position" was "assimilated with" that of the romanticists, especially with Schelling's. Mr. Babbitt has read the review so carelessly that he overlooks four essential facts. (a) The passage of which he complains was expressly presented, "not as a just and balanced account of his opinions and intellectual affinities," but "as an imitation of his own method as an expositor"—a method distinguished by its power to discover the *indicia* of romanticism in almost anybody. (b) Yet, even in this passage, the dualistic character of the author's own ethical view was indicated, and it was pointed out that similar dualistic positions are to be found in well-known romantic writers. (c) The assimilation of Mr. Babbitt's position with romanticism had, however, mainly to do, not with his ethical ideas, but with other notes of the 'romantic'—illusionism, anti-intellectualism, *etc.* That his philosophy does not possess *these* 'romantic' attributes, Mr. Babbitt's reply does nothing to show. (d) The analogy with Schelling referred specifically, not to his ethics, but to "the typical romantic theory of knowledge," which Mr. Babbitt interestingly revives. It is to be added that few philosophies have ever been more "sharply dualistic," even in a religious and ethical sense, than that set forth in Schelling's *Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit* (1809). One may, then, fairly aptly describe Mr. Babbit's book in the terms which he applies to Haym's, as "a brilliant attack on romanticism by a romanticist."

II. My most serious criticism of Mr. Babbitt's methods as a historian of ideas was that, in his zeal to find almost everywhere the marks of romantic degeneracy, he often gives inaccurate and distorted expositions of writings and doctrines. I cited as an example his treatment of Schiller's *Aesthetic Letters* and of the essay *On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry.* After reading Mr. Babbitt's further remarks on Schiller, I find myself constrained to repeat and emphasize this criticism. He has, in his reply, given a fresh series of examples of what I can only describe as amazing exegetical methods. I must, for lack of space, limit myself to four instances.[1]

[1] I omit any detailed comment on Mr. Babbitt's account of Shaftesbury, which completely reverses that moralist's position.

1. To measure the width of the gap between his own and Schiller's aesthetic creed, Mr. Babbitt contrasts their respective views about the "architectonic element in a work of art." For Schiller, he tells us, this element "is the result, not of man's responsible choices, but of natural necessity." What is true with regard to this is simply that Schiller happens to use the *word* "architectonic" in a sense different from Mr. Babbitt's. He is, in the passage referred to, not speaking of "works of art" at all, but of human qualities; and by "architectonic beauty" in man he means beauty of bodily form, which is necessarily the gift of nature. Does Mr. Babbitt suppose it to be "the result of man's responsible choices"? Schiller, however, lengthily insists that there is a higher beauty ("architectonic" in Babbitt's sense) in which *die Natur hat nicht mehr zu gebieten,* and which must necessarily correspond *zu einer moralischen Ursache im Gemüt.* Mr. Babbitt, in short, has substituted his own definitions for Schiller's definitions of the terms the latter employs. It is not thus that a great writer, or any writer, should be read.

2. Schiller's "play-theory of art" especially scandalizes Mr. Babbitt; he finds in it an "encouragement to indolence" and an incitement to aesthetic and moral licence. But he elaborately disregards, and approximately reverses, Schiller's own statement of the meaning of the theory. The *Aesthetische Briefe* carefully distinguish "aesthetic play" from both "physical play" and the idle "play of fancy" (*Spiel der freien Ideenfolge*). In aesthetic play, "*zum erstenmal mischt sich der gesetzgebende Geist in die Handlungen eines blinden Instinktes, und unterwirft das willkürliche Verfahren der Einbildungskraft seiner unveränderlichen ewigen Einheit.*" Man thus learns to take pleasure in things, *nicht, weil sie einem Bedürfnis begegnen, sondern weil sie einem Gesetze Genüge leisten, welches in seinem Busen spricht; nicht, weil sie ihm etwas zu erleiden, sondern weil sie ihm zu handeln geben*" (*27. Brief*). The contrast between mere unrestraint and aesthetic freedom—to which coherent "form" is essential—Schiller illustrates by Homer's picture of the Trojan and the Greek armies. The Trojans "rush on to the field of battle with piercing cries, like a flock of cranes; the Greek army approaches in silence and with grave tread. *Dort sehen wir bloss den Uebermut blinder Kräfte, hier den Sieg der Form und die simple Majestät des Gesetzes.*" (*Ibid.*)

3. In my review I pointed out that, whereas Mr. Babbitt had more than once referred to the essay *On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry* as an expression of eighteenth-century primitivism, it is in fact a direct attack upon primitivism. In his reply Mr. Babbitt admits this, so far as the "primitivism of the intellect" is concerned—though that does not prevent him from again referring to Schiller as a "Rousseauistic primitivist" *tout court*. But he still finds in the essay a "primitivism of the will." This means, it seems, that the "Elysium" to which Schiller would have mankind strive is "conceived expansively"; or again, that the essay expresses merely a nostalgia for a fanciful and impossible "realm of shadows" having no relation to real life. Now, "expansive" (damning fact!) Schiller's ideal undeniably is, in the sense that it aims at a larger and more general realization of the potencies of human nature than has yet been reached. But the essay contains a long warning against the danger of *Phantasterei* which besets "the sentimental genius"—against the "false idealism" which yearns to overstep "the necessary *limits* implied by the very idea of human nature"; and the "endless striving" of which Schiller speaks is, as he often reiterates, directed towards an actual ethical *Veredlung* of our still highly imperfect species. All this, however, avails him nothing in the hour of judgment. Mr. Babbitt is not to be deceived by an author's mere words.

4. Apparently Mr. Babbitt finds in Schiller's conception of the *schöne Seele* some antinomian implication, a disregard of the reality of moral evil, which "the Christian and the classical dualist" emphasize. This, again, is partly misrepresentation of Schiller, partly confusion of ideas. What would a *schöne Seele*, if fully realized, be? The humanistic equivalent of what a saint would be, as conceived by religion—one in whom the habit of doing what the most exacting "law for man" would require has, as Schiller puts it, "become his second nature." Schiller believed that a man's moral development is incomplete so long as the service of the ideal is distasteful to him, so long as his virtue is strained, sour,—and therefore precarious. Moral progress, then, requires what theology would have called an increasing "sanctification" of man. That is, for Schiller, the ethical objective.[2] But he

[2] This is why Schiller gives high (ethical) rank to the idyll, which in his sense means any poetry that gives, for man's encouragement and

repeatedly denies that the objective has been attained, that the "civil war in the cave" is over. *Diese Charakterschönheit, die reifste Frucht seiner Humanität, ist bloss eine Idee, welcher gemäss zu werden, er (der Mensch) mit anhaltender Wachsamkeit streben, aber die er bei aller Anstrengung nie ganz erreichen kann" (Anmut und Würde, 224).*

The glaringly obvious fact about Schiller, which Mr. Babbitt firmly refuses to see, is that he too was intensely preoccupied with the duality of man's constitution. It is a theme from which, in his later prose writings, he could seldom get away. And he was as opposed as Mr. Babbitt to what the latter conceives as the romantic ideal—to merely letting yourself go, to "expansion" without "concentration," to "content" without "form." But he was also opposed to form without content; and he was unable to regard mere inhibition as an end in itself. Schiller realized that both functions of man's nature are indispensable, alike in the art of living and in the fine arts. It had occurred to him—is it not usually forgotten by Mr. Babbitt?—that man has senses and *sentiment* as well as reason and "will," and that there certainly would be no such thing as art if he had not; that a vehicle is not propelled by its brake, though brakes are necessary; and that an "expansive emotion" is not a *malum in se*, needing to be extirpated, but a thing to be harnessed, harmonized with the rest of human nature, and set to work at the creation of art and the enrichment of human life. When, however, Mr. Babbitt finds Schiller, or other writers, recognizing the second of these two complementary truths, he usually represents them as denying or belittling the first—even though they may in fact devote equal or greater pains to emphasizing that side of the matter. It is this practice which vitiates much of the expository portion of his book.

As for the "philosophical difference" between us, which he attempts to summarize in a sentence — generously associating Aristotle with himself and assigning me to Teutonic company—I must confess that even here I seem to detect something less than complete exegetical precision. The discovery that I adhere to an "idealism" of a "highly Teutonic flavor" contains elements of humor which my philosophical confrères, at least, will be able to appreciate. Yet there is, I judge, a philosophical difference be-

incitement, a picture of the attainment of, or near approximation to, this ideal.

tween us; and it consists for one thing in this, that I should insist equally upon both sides of the two-fold truth (or truism) of which I have spoken, while Mr. Babbitt appears to me to see clearly and steadily only one side, to be frequently obsessed by a half-truth. In the degree that it lacks its complement, this half-truth tends to an ethics without warmth, generosity, and humanity, to an impoverished and unprogressive art, to a merely censorious and unimaginative criticism.

Johns Hopkins University. ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY.

GERMANISCHE WORTDEUTUNGEN

2. Gotisch *duginnan* 'beginnen.'

Einen weiteren völlig sicheren Beleg für germ. *-nn-* aus idg. *-nd-* gewährt got. *du-ginnan* nebst den entsprechenden Verben der übrigen altgermanischen Sprachen: ahd. *biginnan, inginnan,* as. ags. *beginnan,* ags. *onginnan,* afries. *biienna:* sämtlich in der Bedeutung von engl. 'to begin' oder nhd. 'beginnen.' Das hier vorliegende altgerm. Verbum ist identisch mit griech. χανδάνω (bezw. *χένδω) und lat. *pre-hendo.* Die Berührung mit letzterem ist sogar enger, als es auf den ersten Blick scheinen mag. Wir bekommen ja von lat. *prehendo* zunächst den Eindruck, dass es seine Formen (z. B. Perf. *prehendī,* Supinum *prehensum*) durchweg von demselben Stamme bildet. Aber ursprünglich war der Stamm im Präsens ein andrer, als im Perf. und Supinum, nämlich dort *(g)hénd-,* hier *(g)h'nd-* mit silbebildendem Nasal. Der Unterschied ist im historischen Latein sowenig mehr zu erkennen, wie etwa bei *endo* (mit *en* = griech. ἐν) und *centum* (mit *en* aus *'n* = gr. α in ἑ-κατόν). Aber er tritt deutlich hervor, wenn man die Tempusbildung des lat. Verbums mit den entsprechenden Formen im Griechischen und Germanischen vergleicht. Dem *-hend-* des Präsens entsprechen im Griech. die vom Stamme χενδ- gebildeten Formen, also namentlich das Fut. (3. sg.) χείσεται aus *χένδ-σε-ται; wie im Germanischen das Präsens *-ginnan.* Dem *-hend-* des lat. Perfekts u. Supins (*-hensum* aus **hent-tu-m*) dagegen stehen im Griech. die Aoristformen (3. sg.) ἔχαδε oder χάδε und (Inf.) χαδέειν zur Seite, sowie alle Formen, welche das α (aus *'n,* d. h. silbebildendem Nasal) dieser Aoristform teilen,

z. B. ἐχάνδανον, κεχανδότα. Im Germanischen entspricht den Formen dieser letzteren Art der Stamm *gunn-* (oder *-gonn-*), wie er im Plur. Prät. (3. pl. *du-gunnun*) und—ausserhalb des Gotischen—im schwachen Prät. vorliegt.

Statt mit got. *du-ginnan* hat man bis jetzt χανδάνω und *prehendo* mit got. *bi-gitan* 'finden' (= engl. *to get, forget,* nhd. in *vergessen* und *ergötzen*) verbunden. So z. B. Kluge, Etym. Wtb. s. v. *vergessen,* Falk u. Torp in Ficks Vgl. Wtb. III, 123, Walde, Lat. Et. Wtb. s. v. *pre-hendo* (wo man weitere literar. Nachweise findet).[1] Welche von den beiden Auffassungen den Vorzug verdient, kann nicht zweifelhaft sein. Man erwäge: (1) Von den zahlreichen Verbal- und Nominalformen, die sich im Lateinischen an *prehendo* anschliessen, weist jede einzelne einen Nasal auf; (2) Sämtliche Formen, die im Griechischen zu χανδάνω gehören, enthalten entweder direkt einen Nasal oder haben wenigstens ein aus silbebildendem Nasal entstandenes α (wie ἔχαδον aus *ἔχ'νδον); (3) Kymr. *genni* 'contineri, comprehendi, capi,' das Stokes IF. II (1893) 170 mit Recht zu χαιδάνω und *prehendo* stellt, stimmt hinsichtlich des Nasals zum Griechischen und Lateinischen.—Also bleibt Thurneysen (a. a. O., S. 80 u. 81) im Rechte, wenn er den Nasal in *χέndō für wurzelhaft erklärt, wodurch die Vergleichung mit germ. *gitan* hinfällig wird.

Für die germanische Grammatik ist das gewonnene Ergebnis namentlich deshalb von Interesse, weil es uns in den Stand setzt, über eine Reihe ungelöster Probleme mit grösserer Sicherheit, als es bisher möglich war, zu urteilen. Es handelt sich um Beziehungen zwischen den Verben *beginnen,* (engl. *to begin*), *gönnen* und *können* (engl. *I can*) in der Bildung des schwachen Präteritums, und um die Frage, ob *beginnen* von Haus aus nur ein starkes oder ausserdem auch ein schwaches Präter. besessen habe.

Ich beabsichtige nicht, die hier vorliegenden, sehr schwierigen Fragen von neuem in ihrem vollen Umfange aufzurollen, sondern

[1] Nachzutragen wäre etwa der lehrreiche Aufsatz von R. Thurneysen 'Der Präsenstypus λιμπάνω' IF. IV (1894) 78-84.—Für die Erklärung des Verbalpräfixes begnügt sich Walde mit einem Verweise auf Lindsay-Nohl 48*a* 1, wo *prĕ-* auf *prae-* zurückgeführt wird. Richtiger dürfte es sein, von **pere-χendo* aus **peri-χendo* auszugehen, also das Präfix der griech. Präposition περί = aind. *pári* gleichzusetzen. Sogar die Herleitung von *prehendo* aus * *perhendo* (also Annahme von Metathesis) würde ich der von Walde angeführten Erklärung vorziehen.

möchte nur einen Nachtrag zu meiner Besprechung der verschiedenen Ansichten in der *Hesperia* I (1912) S. 51 ff. liefern. Bei so verwickelten Problemen kommt es immer in erster Linie darauf an, irgendwo und womöglich an mehr als einer Stelle festen Boden unter den Füssen zu gewinnen. Das war bisher nur bei dem Prät.-Präsens *kann,* pl. *kunnum* möglich. Alles spricht dafür, dass das Gotische hier in dem Präteritum *kunþa* die urgermanische Bildung gewahrt hat, und dass alle Abweichungen von diesem Typus als Neubildungen gelten müssen.

Jetzt nun lässt sich, wenn ich nicht irre, ausserdem mit Sicherheit feststellen, wie das schwache Präteritum von *biginnan* im Urgermanischen dereinst gelautet haben muss, vorausgesetzt natürlich, nicht nur dass das Urgermanische bei diesem Verbum ein schw. Präteritum kannte, sondern auch, dass dieses Prt. in alter, regelrechter Weise gebildet war. Auszugehen ist von der Beobachtung, dass der Dental des schw. Präter. (oder genauer: der Plural- u. Opt.-formen dieses Prt.) sich von Haus aus mit dem Dental der idg. *to-* Partizipien und *ti-* Abstrakta deckte. Für Beispiele und alles Einzelne sei auf *Hesperia* I, S. 29-93 verwiesen. Wo die Regel durchbrochen scheint, wie z. B. in *Kunst* neben *konnte, Gunst* neben *gönnte, Schuld* neben *sollte,* liegen Neubildungen (sei es auf seiten der Präterita oder der Verbalnomina) vor, die durchweg erst der nach-gotischen Epoche angehören.

Weiter hilft zum Verständnis der Lautgestalt der schw. Präterita die Erkenntnis, die wir vorwiegend den Untersuchungen von F. Fröhde BB. I (1877) S. 177 ff.; R. Kögel PBB. VII (1880) S. 171 ff. und F. Kluge, ebd. IX (1884) S. 150 ff. verdanken— obgleich keiner von ihnen sie mit dieser Bestimmtheit ausgesprochen hat—, dass nämlich die Behandlung der Lautgruppen *s* + Dental und Dental + Dental im Germanischen und Lateinischen nicht nur im wesentlichen, sondern fast in jeder Einzelheit dieselbe ist. Das Lateinische also kann uns Aufklärung über *to*-Partizipien und schwache Präterita gewähren, die im Germanischen nicht mehr in ihrer alten Form erhalten sind.

Somit dürfen wir vielleicht von dem *to*-Partizip lat. (*pre*)-*hensus* Aufklärung über das schw. Prät. des Verbums (*bi*)-*ginnan* erwarten. (*pre*)-*hensus* steht auf gleicher Lautstufe mit dem Adj. *prō-pensus* 'geneigt' (urspr. ptc. p. zu *prō-pendeo*). Wie letzterem im Germanischen das Adj. *funs* 'bereit' zur Seite steht

(vgl. Kluge, PBB. IX, 154),[2] so würde dem Ptc. (*pre*)-*henso*- germ. *(*bi*)-*guns* entsprechen. Das zugehörige schwache Prät. würde germ. *(*bi*)-*gunsa* lauten. Genau in dieser Form begegnen die entsprechenden Wörter im Germanischen nicht. Aber dem zu erwartenden Partizipialstamme[3] steht das Subst. *bi-gunst* f. 'Beginn' (Graff, IV, 215) zur Seite, während das schw. Prät. von *bi-ginnan* im ältesten Ahd. (Isidor-Übs., Ende des 8. Jh.) *bigunsta* (3. sg., Is. 38, 17), plur. *bigunston* (3. pl., ebd. 30, 21) lautet. Diese historischen Formen sehen den vorhin erschlossenen prähistorischen so ähnlich, dass es in der Tat merkwürdig wäre, wenn sie nichts mit einander zu tun hätten.

Hier aber werden wir ausser *beginnen* die beiden Verba *gönnen* und *können* heranziehen müssen. Diese Verben stehen sich in ihrer Tempusbildung einerseits so nahe und andrerseits so fern, dass sie notwendig den Trieb nach Berichtigung der Sprechmittel (durch Beseitigung scheinbarer Unregelmässigkeiten und unnötiger Abweichungen), den jede Generation besitzt, herausfordern mussten. Für die älteste Zeit lässt sich die Bildung der beiden Präterita und der zugehörigen Verbalnomina bei ihnen vermutungsweise folgendermassen herstellen:

Starkes Präteritum: (sg.) (pl.)	Verbalnomen: (Adj. od. Subst.)	Schw. Präteritum:
bi-gann, *bi-gunnum* (Präs. *bi-ginnan*)	**bi-guns* f. (später *bi-gunst-s*)	**bi-gunsa* (später *bi-gunsta*)
ann, *unnum* (urspr. **annum?*) (Prät.-Präs. 'gönnen')	*anst-s* f. (später *unst-s* 'Gunst')	**ansta* (?) (später (*gi-*)*onsta*)
kann, *kunnum* (Prät.-Präs. 'können')	*kunþ-s* Adj. 'kund'	*kunþa*

[2] *funsa-* wird von Falk und Torp, S. 228 (s. v. *fundon*) aus "*fundsa*" erklärt, was völlig verfehlt ist. Einwandsfrei dagegen war Kluges Annahme (a. a. O., S. 154), *funso-* stehe zunächst für *funsso-*, und letzteres sei verschoben aus *p'ntto-*. Nur muss man sich klar machen, dass Lateinisch und Germanisch hier in der Verschiebung ein Stück Weges zusammengehen. Schon in uralter Zeit wurde *p'ntto* zu *p'nsso* und letzteres zu *p'nso* verändert. Lat. *pensum* und Germ. *funs*(*a*) setzen gemeinsam letztere Form (nicht eine Form mit *tt* oder *ds*) voraus.

[3] genauer: einem entsprechenden *ti-* Stamme, der sich zu dem *to-* Stamme **-guns* verhält, wie der Stamm *-hensi-* in Lat. *com-pre-hensi-ō* zu *-henso-* in *com-pre-hensu-s*.

Während die starken Präterita den Eindruck völlig gleichartiger Bildung machen, gehen die Verbalnomina und schwachen Präterita weit auseinander. Nun konnte man ja wohl den Verbalnomina—wie in andern ähnlichen Fällen—einen gewissen Grad von Selbständigkeit einräumen, obgleich sich auch hier im Laufe der Zeit bei Substantiven wie *Kunst* und *Gunst* die Mischung der Typen geltend macht. Aber beim schwachen Präteritum scheint man schon früh das Bedürfnis nach völliger Neuregulierung (oder nach der Absicht der Sprechenden: Richtigstellung) der verwirrenden Formenmenge empfunden zu haben. Anfangs mag sich die Korrektur darauf beschränkt haben, dass man den unklar gewordenen Formen **bi-guns* und **bi-gunsa* zur Verdeutlichung ihrer Funktion ein *st* statt des *s* gab; ähnlich wie got. *wissa* im Ahd. zu *wista* (Is.) und *westa* (Tat., Otfr.) umgeformt erscheint. Das bedeutet praktisch—wenigstens so weit es sich um den Dental handelt—eine Reduktion der ursprünglich vorhandenen drei Typen auf zwei. Aber vielleicht wurde dadurch die Konkurrenz unter den beiden letzteren verschärft. Meist hält man sich an das Präter. *kunþa,* um darnach (*gi-*)*onsta* und *bi-gunsta* zu *unþa* (= ags. *ūðe,* Otfr. *onda*) und *bigunþa* (= ahd. *bigonda,* Tat. u. Otfr.) umzugestalten. Aber z. B. im Heliand zeigt sich umgekehrt ein völliger Sieg des Typus (*gi-*)*onsta, bi-gonsta,* so dass z. B. *kunþa* selbst zu *konsta* umgestaltet ist. Sonst half man sich wohl mit gänzlicher Aufgabe der regelwidrigen Formen. Z. B. ist im Gotischen von dem Prät.-Präs. *ann* nur das Verbalnomen *ansts* 'Gnade, Gunst' nebst dem Adj. *ansteigs* 'gnädig' beibehalten. Aus diesem Grunde darf man auf die Tatsache, dass das Gotische von *bi-ginnan* kein schwaches Präteritum bildet, nicht allzugrosses Gewicht legen. Das Gotische steht darin auf gleicher Stufe mit dem Neuhochd. und Neuenglischen, die gleichfalls zu *beginnen,* engl. *to begin,* nur ein starkes Prät. bilden. Aber dem älteren Neuhochd. und dem Mittelenglischen war das schwache Präteritum nicht fremd.

Im Laufe der Zeit gesellt sich als dritter Rivale der zu *skulda* 'sollte' und *wilda* 'wollte' stimmende Typus *munda* 'gedachte' hinzu, der von Haus aus zu *man, munnum* (mit einfachem Nasal!) gehört. In engl. *could* 'konnte,' nhd. *konnte, gönnte* hat dieser Typus die älteren Formen verdrängt. Aber die Darstellung

dieser jüngsten Wandlungen gehört nicht mehr in den Rahmen der Etymologie von *beginnen*, mit der wir es hier hauptsächlich zu tun haben.

Johns Hopkins University. HERMANN COLLITZ.

DID WORDSWORTH JEST WITH MATTHEW?

In his recent article "Wordsworth Bandies Jests with Matthew" (*MLN.* XXXI, 408), Professor Campbell contends that we lose the spirit of Wordsworth's companion poems *Expostulation and Reply* and *The Tables Turned* by taking them too seriously. They are, he says in effect, not a solemn exposition of the poet's philosophy, but dramatic studies animated by a boyish spirit of fun. Incidentally they contribute to the characterization of "an engaging fellow called Matthew." This interpretation, plausible and attractive as it may seem at first, is open to some objections, which deserve consideration.

1. There is nothing in the poems themselves to suggest that they are not what they purport to be—a sober and truthful statement of Wordsworth's well-known views on the influence of Nature over man's inner life, on the spiritual strength gained from a "wise passiveness," and on the comparatively small place held by mere book-learning in man's spiritual growth. Their form is obviously dramatic, if by "dramatic" we mean that they are cast in the form of a lyrical dialogue. But it does not follow from this that the persons of the little drama are imaginary, or that each speaker does not sincerely believe in the view he advocates. One, at least, of the two speakers is not a creature of imagination. Under the name of William, the poet is admittedly speaking to us in his own person, and he says precisely what we should expect him to say from our knowledge of his life, his poetry, and his character. He has, moreover, the better of the argument and the last word. No one credits Wordsworth with jesting when he expresses the same or similar ideas in his other poems; why then was he not serious here? Surely to prove to us that Wordsworth was jesting would require the strongest and most specific evidence.

2. As there is nothing in the poems themselves to show that they are not to be taken seriously, the existence of a strain of

humor in them must be established by external evidence. This evidence is sought for in the character of Matthew, the student and book-lover who reproves William for his apparent idleness. This Matthew is assumed to be the same person as Matthew, the village schoolmaster, the central figure in some four or five of Wordsworth's best-known poems. This Matthew, the schoolmaster, according to Professor Campbell, is a whimsical, fantastic character, who cannot be sad or serious for long. We have but to remember that Matthew, the schoolmaster, is frolicsome and erratic, and it becomes evident that Matthew, the book-lover, is not in earnest in his praise of learning. Assuming for the moment, that the two Matthews are identical and that the character of the schoolmaster is fully and faithfully presented by Professor Campbell, does this prove that Wordsworth jested with Matthew? Does it not merely prove at most that Matthew jested with Wordsworth? Of course, Wordsworth lectures Matthew and turns the tables on him with good spirit in the succeeding poem; but is there anything to show that Wordsworth, who is not accounted quick in such matters, ever saw Matthew's joke?

3. But the evidence that Matthew was jesting is very far from convincing. Professor Campbell virtually rests his whole argument on our correct understanding of the peculiarities of Matthew. "Matthew's character," he says, "must be clearly understood by any one who hopes to interpret these lines aright." "This schoolmaster," says Wordsworth in his note to the poem called *Matthew*, "was made up of several both of his class and of men of other occupations."

The more I study the whole series of Matthew poems, the more fully I am persuaded that Wordsworth did not succeed in fusing these different originals into one convincing and consistent personality. It would rather seem as if Wordsworth had written the several poems in which this composite Matthew appears, with now one and now another of his models chiefly or exclusively in mind. As Mr. Eric Robertson says: "The long and short about the 'Matthew' is—these poems are each exquisite; as a group intended to portray one ideal character, they are unacceptable."[1] There are some three or four distinct Matthews, alike in some particulars but differing widely in others. There is, for instance, the Matthew

[1] *Wordsworth and the English Lake Country*, p. 134.

whose eccentricities are graphically portrayed in the poem that bears his name. But this mad-cap Matthew seems far removed from the venerable and benevolent "Master" in the *Address to the Scholars of the Village School.* We have still another Matthew in *The Two April Mornings* and *The Fountain* a brave, patient, wholesome old man, bereft of those he has loved best, very lonely and sorrowful, but able to face the world smiling or even, at times, to sing his gay songs. In this Matthew, Wordsworth has created for us a profoundly moving, heroic, almost tragic figure, not unworthy to stand beside the old shepherd Michael. But the moment we attempt to identify this Matthew who is distinguished above all by his fundamental depth and constancy of feeling, with Matthew the Jester, whose moods are always changing and "evanescent," we become involved in contradictions, and our conception of the characters of both Matthews becomes hopelessly blurred and confused.

If, then, Matthew is different in different poems, why should we not have still another Matthew, in *Expostulation and Reply?* Or, why should we choose one Matthew rather than another, if we determine to interpret the character of Matthew, the student, by evidence from without?

4. But even if we regard Matthew as a single and consistent character, and assume the identity of the Matthew of the series, with the book-lover of *Expostulation and Reply,* we still fail to establish the humorous strain in that poem. To do this, it is not sufficient to prove that Matthew is fond of jesting, but that he was actually in a jesting mood on this particular occasion. His capacity for an intense seriousness is at least as characteristic a trait of Matthew's character as his cheerfulness, or as his delight in merriment. Even Matthew the Jester, wayward and volatile as he is, has moods of profound seriousness and concentrated thought, while the Matthew of the *Two April Mornings* and *The Fountain* is certainly not in a jesting mood; there is nothing to show that on this occasion, as in others he was not serious.

5. Finally, a consideration of the chronology of the question, and of the circumstances under which the two poems were written, only tends to make Professor Campbell's position less secure. Wordsworth tells us that *Expostulation and Reply* and *The Tables Turned* were composed in the spring of 1798, when the poet was

living at Alfoxden. Now at this time not one of the series of "Matthew poems" had been written. The Jesting Matthew, who is called in to prove the humorous strain in these philosophic studies, had no literary existence in Wordsworth's verse when these poems were composed. If he lived at all as an imaginary being yet unborn, it was only as a future possibility in the poet's mind.

Nor are we justified in assuming that this scholastic Matthew of the earlier poems was a preliminary sketch of the Matthew—or Matthews—of the yet unwritten series. He is, so far as appears, totally unlike the composite Matthew, if there be one, or any Matthew of the group. He is not introduced as the Village Schoolmaster, but as the poet's "friend," nor is there any mention made of the characteristic grey hair or the still more significant cheerfulness of the Matthew pictured in the later poems.

Who, then, was the earlier Matthew? Were the poems suggested by an actual occurrence, or is the whole incident merely imagined by the poet in order that he may expound his favorite doctrine? Wordsworth himself partly answers this question for us in the "Advertisement" prefixed to the first edition of the *Lyrical Ballads*. "The lines entitled *Expostulation and Reply*, and those which follow, arose out of a conversation with a friend who was somewhat unreasonably attached to modern books of moral philosophy." We are not told when this conversation took place, but if this passage stood alone, we would naturally assume that the poems were written shortly after the occurrence of the incident which suggested them. The scene of the encounter, however, purports to be Esthwaite Lake, near Hawkshead, and the fact that the poet describes himself as one to whom "life was sweet I knew not why" certainly suggests that Wordsworth was yet a schoolboy, or, at least very young. But if we conclude from this that the conversation as reported in the poems actually took place at Hawkshead before the poet had left school, we are confronted with a very real difficulty. That a boy of sixteen, who spent his morning sitting passively on a stone, should be rebuked for his apparent idleness is natural enough But that any schoolboy, however precocious, ever met the charge of idleness with an exposition of the relations between Man and Nature, at once original and profound, is surely beyond belief. Clearly William's reply does not express Wordsworth's youthful attitude toward

Nature, as he has described it in *Tintern Abbey* and elsewhere; it rather stands out as one of the best statements of the characteristic philosophy of his maturity. If this Matthew's expostulation was indeed uttered at Hawkshead, when Wordsworth was a pupil, the poet's response, as it appears in the poem, seems to have been made at Alfoxden after an interval of some ten or eleven years. This cannot be properly called a "conversation." We are thus left to conjecture. My own guess would be that the "conversation" out of which the poem "arose" occurred at Alfoxden, and that the other speaker was Coleridge, who was certainly addicted to the study of philosophy, and with whom Wordsworth was constantly thrown at that time! Wordsworth, who often avoided literal accuracy, and who perhaps remembered some similar incident at Hawkshead in days long past, altered the time and place of the conversation with little regard to probability.

The whole matter may seem of minor importance and hardly worth discussion, but as Professor Campbell's views would force us to misinterpret the *Two April Mornings* and *The Fountain,* two of Wordsworth's most beautiful and significant poems, the matter is not so trifling as it might at first appear. Mr. John Morley, like Professor Campbell, has declared that the famous lines in *The Reply:*

One impulse from a vernal wood, etc.

"cannot be taken seriously as more than a half-playful sally for the benefit of some too-bookish friend. No impulse from a vernal wood can tell us anything at all of moral evil and of good." To say this is to strike at the very life of Wordsworth's teaching. If this is so then, as Professor Raleigh says, "The secret of his (Wordsworth's) strength is stolen from him." I entirely agree with Professor Raleigh's conclusion that "it is best, at any rate, and wisest to disbelieve anyone who says that a great poet does not believe that which he many times solemnly asserts."[2]

HENRY S. PANCOAST.

Philadelphia.

---

[2] Sir Walter Raleigh's *Wordsworth*, p. 132.

CHURCH-AND-STAGE CONTROVERSY IN GRANADA

An anonymous pamphlet of forty-eight pages, including the title-page, signatures A-F, formerly belonging to Gayangos, now in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid, contains some information not devoid of interest for the history of the Spanish stage. The title runs as follows: ✠ /DOMINE, NON NE BONUM/ *semen seminasti in agro tuo? Vnde ergó / habet zizania? Et ait illis: Inimicus homo fecit.* Matth. 13. 27. 28. // The text begins on the title-page.

It is an answer to a pamphlet in favor of the stage, entitled *Discurso juridico, y moral sobre lo licito de las Comedias y su admission,* which itself was an attack against two anti-stage pamphlets, one entitled *La Fidelidad persuadida y el escandalo impugnado,* the other bearing the epigram *Ecce labio* (sic) *mea non prohibebo* (sic). I have been unable to identify or trace any of the three pamphlets just named.

However, from the *Domine* pamphlet an idea may be gained of the contents of the *Discurso.* The latter considered stage-plays

> ya Actos indiferentes, ya Antídoto, y medicina, que sirve de reparo a la vida humana, ya [repeating Cicero's worn definition] exemplo de la vida de el hombre; espejo de las costumbres; é imagen de la verdad.[1]

To refute the contention that plays are examples of living, the author of our pamphlet paints the stage hero as he knows him, always on a tireless, merciless woman-hunt.

> Y á estos desatinos, errores, y locuras, los bautizan con los titulos de fineza, de constancia, de generosidad.

As for the women:

> tambien se traen en las Comedias, que se usan, exemplares de mujeres, que para que la correspondencia con sus amantes no cesse, executan mil engaños, cautelas, y ossadias; burlando con arte, y con astucia, las atenciones y desvelo del Padre mas vigilante, y del esposo mas honrado, que zelan su honor pundonorosos.[2]

The plots are calculated to bring out the worst in women:

> Tambien se traen exemplares de tercerias artificiosas, con que la dama se vale de la criada confidente, para que la communicacion lasciva no se

[1] *Domine*, etc., p. 3.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

acabe. Exponense á la vista mujeres, que admiten al galan con agrado, y cautelosamente lo escondan. Otras, que recibiendo el papel, en que son solicitadas para deleytes impuros responden con falsedad, obligando con tibieza, y con desvio, á que se esfuerçe con mayor empeño el pretendiente. Discurrase lo mismo de las sangrientas, y crueles leyes de el duelo, las quales se vèn a cada passo en el Theatro estrechamente observadas.

The very titles, he observes, show sufficiently the tendency of such plays: *Antes que todo es mi dama* [Calderon], *Todo lo vence el Amor*,[3] *El Amor todo lo puede* [?], *El Amor haze discretos* [?], *El Amor haze valientes* [?].[4]

Far from being a mirror of truth, plays are its veriest distortion:

La verdad primera dize: que se huyga la torpeza. Pero la Comedia afirma, que *porfiando vence Amor* [Lope]. La verdad primera enseña: Que amemos al enemigo. Pero las Comedias persuaden, que *el no vengarse es Deshonra* [?]. La verdad primera llama locos a todos los pecadores. Pero las Comedias representan, que el que se niega a passiones amorosas, es necio, rustico, y grosero.[5]

The author is most indignant, however, at the representation of Christ or the Virgin by common actors and actresses, a feeling which, perhaps first expressed in Spain by Vives (1522), had been growing stronger since Mariana (1609), and probably had not a little to do with the final suppression of the *auto:*

Y si tal vez los Farsantes, o Comediantes, hazen representacion de Christo N. Señor, de su Madre Santissima, o de algun Santo, es profanando, y quitando la veneracion debida al Representado, por la vileza, y estragada vida, y exercicio de quien lo representa.

A quien no horriza vèr, que vna mugercilla, que sin mucha temeridad puede juzgarse libiana; y quando no lo sea, que mayor indecencia, la que represente oy a la madre de la Pureza, que mañana se finge Diosa del amor profano! mas si alguno de los Farsantes representa, o a Jesu Christo, o a algun Santo, que monstruosidad no es vèr, que a Jesu Christo, Dios, y Hombre; o a vn hombre puro, pero Santo, le represente un truhan, que ha cedido la fidelidad debida al matrimonio, por lo qual le privan las leyes, de que pueda querellarse, deque su muger le es adultera.

After his vigorous refutation of the *Discurso juridico* our anonymous author proceeds to defend what must have been the main

[3] Don Antonio de Zamora (*ca.* 1660-*ca.* 1722?). First published in a collection of 1772, La Barrera, *Catálogo*, p. 504.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

thesis of the *Fidelidad persuadida,* namely, that the vow made by the city of Granada on Sept. 1, 1706, to abolish stage-plays was valid and should be kept. This resolution on the part of the city of Granada was one of the results of a campaign, conducted by prominent, energetic, and often talented pulpit orators, which lasted until the end of the eighteenth century, and came near uprooting the theater in the peninsula. In 1679 the famous missionary Father Tirso Gonzalez brought about a suspension of stage-plays in Seville, which was maintained during a century. In 1694 Córdoba was won over by Father Francisco Posadas.[6] Granada came next, and later on Tudela (1715) and Pamplona (1721).[7] The method followed was to persuade the *cabildo* of the local church to adopt a vow to abolish all stage-plays. The ostensible object would be to thank the Lord by so doing for having preserved the city from some calamity (in Pamplona, it was the plague of Marseilles), or to call Heaven's blessings on the military enterprises of the king, as was the case in Granada. The town council would then register the vow or join in it, and the *Consejo de Castilla* or even the king would be requested to approve the vow and make it binding. Usually, the zeal induced by the preacher would wane in a few years, and efforts would be made to obtain a release from the vow. This was not always easy (in Pamplona a papal brief had to be retracted to accomplish the release), but in Granada it came about through the *Real Cédula* of 1725, which applied to the whole country.[8]

Sr. Cotarelo writes that "segun asegura el autor de *Pantoja* II,"[9] the text of the vow and the various proceedings were recorded in 1714 by the *escribano mayor* of the *cabildo* and printed. The latter statement is confirmed by our pamphlet, which refers to the text of the resolution as having been printed by order of the city. The text of the *acuerdo* is given as follows:

Acordò (assintiendo à los expressados en los memoriales, y representaciones de nuestro Illustrissimo Prelado, y Cabildo desta Santa Iglesia;

---

[6] Cotarelo, *Bibliografía de las controversias sobre la licitud del teatro en España,* Madrid, 1904, p. 28.

[7] Cotarelo, pp. 571, 496.

[8] Cotarelo, p. 328.

[9] *L. c.,* p. 328. *Pantoja* is D. Simon Lopez' *Pantoja o resolucion . . . ,* Parte segunda, etc., Murcia, 1814. Cotarelo, pp. 398 and 412.

sus Religiones, y Superiores de ellas; señor Abad, y Vniversidad de Beneficiados, y condescendiendo con sus justas, y piadosas peticiones) que esta ciudad debe ocurrir al remedio de los daños, y perjuizios, que ocasionan las Comedias, Theatros, y Representaciones publicas, como oy se escriven, y executan, en perjuizio de la honestidad de todos estados, y ambos sexos; prohibiendo, y desterrando para siempre (por Voto de esta Ciudad) las Comedias, y representaciones. Cuya solucion discurre, que no solo cederà en servicio de nuestro amado Rey, y señor natural Don Phelipe V. como medio que le ayude a merecer las assistencias de Dios, para triumphar de sus enemigos, acreditando mas, y mas el amor, y fidelidad desta Cindad, y sus Capitulares, con publica, y comun vtilidad de todo el Reyno, en la reformacion deste abuso, que tanto ha estragado sus costumbres; sino que serà vn sacrificio muy acepto a la Magestad Divina: cuya mayor honra, y gloria debe ser siempre objecto principal de todos los Acuerdos, y resoluciones de esta Nobilissima, y Religiosissima Ciudad.

The author's contention is that the vow of 1706 was not only valid and binding on the city, but that it was a religious vow, binding forever: "Porque en dicho decreto ay todas las condiciones essenciales, y que bastan para que vna ciudad quede obligada a Dios por Voto Religioso."[10] He then gives some interesting details on the manner in which the city had met the difficulty of losing the rental of the playhouse, a difficulty which had often brought similar vows to naught, because the local hospital usually received the money. In Granada they decided in 1706

Que los un mil ducados en que estaba arrendada [la Casa], se reintegrassen de sus consignados alimentos; y que solo se librassen a los Cavalleros Comissarios de las Fiestas del Santissimo Sacramento dos mil ducados, y no los tres mil, que se les libraran siempre; puesto que les relevaba de mayores gastos, y costa, que les tenian los Comediantes, Autos, Saynetes, trages, tramoyas, &c.

After a final volley of texts and some reference to other cities which had followed Granada, the pamphlet, which is vigorously and in parts entertainingly written, comes to an end.

It has thus far apparently remained unknown. It reveals the titles of three more, equally unknown pamphlets, suggesting that, in spite of Sr. Cotarelo's copious compilation, a good deal remains to be learned about the relations between the Spanish church and stage. To fix the date of the pamphlet would seem easy. It almost certainly belongs to the eighteenth century. The vow of 1706 provides the *terminus a quo*. The *Real Cédula* of 1725, bringing re-

[10] P. 28.

lease from it, would naturally set the *terminus ad quem.* None of the plays referred to (at least none of those I could identify) appeared before that date. Yet there are some puzzling references which might put this in doubt. Thus, on page 47 it is said that Écija has taken the vow, and that Baeza has transformed its theater into a church. But these two towns appear to have been won over only in 1787 [11] by Father Cadiz. It is possible then that the author of this pamphlet was merely trying to help Father Cadiz (who is known to have been trying, in 1779, to reclaim the backsliding city of Granada)[12] by showing that the vow of 1706 was still binding. But the references to *autos* [13] and to impersonations of Christ seem less likely to have occurred years after the official abolition of the *autos* (1765). And, of course, Écija and Baeza may well have taken the vow earlier in the century without having published it officially.

It may be of interest to add a few details of literary history which the examination of a number of similar pamphlets brought to light. The *Arbitraje politico-militar,* one of the most violent of the numerous pamphlets in the famous controversy on Father Guerra's *Aprobacion* of Calderón, numbers in the second edition (1683) thirty-eight pages (against thirty-five in the first),[14] and there was added to it a full-page woodcut showing through an ornamental portico a schoolmaster at his desk brandishing the rod, and a crowd of children on the floor, fighting, teasing each other, and some even swarming up the shelves above the master's head.

Sr. Cotarelo [15] lists "hacia 1775" the publication of a *Carta politica* to which an answer was made by D. Agustin Valentín de la Iglesia. Since the latter speaks of the author as living, and his description of the *Carta politica* does not coincide with the well-known *Carta philologica* of Cascales, Sr. Cotarelo concludes: "más creible es, ó en una coincidencia de nombres (excepto el *Don*) y de título, ó que el autor moderno tomó como seudónimo el nombre del erudito de principios del siglo XVII." The fact is that the *Carta Politica* is merely a reprint of the *Carta philologica,* with the following title: ✠ /Carta politica, / escrita por el Lic.do.

[11] Cotarelo, p. 411.
[12] Cotarelo, p. 105.
[13] P. 27.
[14] Cotarelo, p. 62.
[15] P. 144.

/ Don Francisco / Cascales, / al apolo de España / Lope de Vega / Carpio, / el año de 1634. / En defensa de las Comedias, / y representacion de ellas. / Segunda Impression. /—/ CON LICENCIA. En Madrid: En la Imprenta, y Libre- / ría de Joseph Garcia Lanza, Plazuela del Angel. / Año de 1756. // 4°. Title-sheet and sixteen numbered pages. Sigs. A-B.

JOSEPH E. GILLET.

University of Minnesota.

SCOGAN'S *QUEM QUAERITIS*

It would be hard to imagine a less likely place than *Scoggins Jests* from which to extract a seriously worthy new version of the Easter *Quem Quaeritis*. As well go to Mr. Dooley for light on modern Irish drama as to Scogan for light on liturgical drama. Yet both mediæval and modern clowns might conceivably have directed jests illuminatingly over the respective subjects.

The mysterious compiler who acted humble Boswell to Scogan or Scoggin by recounting his jests helps to prove, I believe, that what Chambers thinks the highest development of the Easter drama, the form in which Christ himself appears, was fairly common in England as well as on the Continent. Professor Young has recently published one fourteenth century English play of that form.[1] Scogan seems to indicate a wider knowledge of the type in England. Chambers knew only Continental versions. He says:[2] "The addition of the apostle scene completed the evolution of the Easter play for the majority of churches. There were, however, a few in which the very important step was taken of introducing the person of the risen Christ himself; and this naturally entailed yet another new scene. Of this type there are fifteen extant versions, coming from one Italian, four French, and four German churches. . . . Here (in a Fleury play which he describes as an example) the Christ appears twice, first disguised *in similitudinem hortolani,* afterwards *in similitudinem domini* with the *labarum* or resurrection banner."

[1] *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters,* XVI, part 2 (1909), 929-30.

[2] *The Mediæval Stage* (1903), II, 31-2.

One of Scogan's ungodly practical jokes needed for a setting just this kind of Easter play, and the author's mood was for going into interesting details. This occurs only in the 1613 edition of *Scoggins Iestes. Wherein is declared his pleasant pastimes in France; and of his meriments among the Fryers: full of delight and honest mirthe.* Of this book the one copy now extant, so far as I am aware, is that in the Bodleian library which I have examined and described for a recently published investigation into Scogan's slippery identity.[3] It gives a quite different lot of jests from those of the 1626 edition reprinted by Hazlitt in his *Shakespeare Jest-Books.* The tale of the Easter play is the eighth jest, although the book has no numbering of pages or jests which may be referred to. It is in Scogan's best scurrilous vein:

How Scoggin set a whole towne together by the eares. At Easter following Scoggin came to the same Village againe, at which time the Parson of the towne (according to the order of the popish Clergie would needes haue a stage play,) [parenthesis sic] and as in that age the whole earth was almost planted with superstition & idolatry, so such like prophane pastimes was greatly delighted in, especially playes made of the Scripture at an Easter, as I said before) the Parson of the Village would haue a play of the resurrection of the Lord, and for because the men were not learned, nor could not reade, hee tooke a lemman that he kept (hauing but one eye) and put her in the graue of an Angell which when Scoggin saw, he went to two of the simplest fellowes in the towne, that plaid the three *Maries:* and the Parson himselfe plaid Christ with a banner in his hand. Then said Scoggin to the simple fellowes when the Angell asketh you whom you seeke, you must say the Parsons lemman with one eye, so it fortuned that the time was come that they must play and the Angell asked them whom they sought? Marry .quoth they, as Scoggin had taught them, wee seeke the Priestes lemman with one eye, which when the woman hearde, she arose out of the graue and all to be scratched one of the poore fellowes by the face that plaid one of the three *Maries:* Whereupon hee soundly buffeted her about the eares, the priest seeing this threw down his banner and went to helpe his lemman, with that the other two fell upon the Priest, the clerkes likewise tooke the priests part, and many other of the parisioners on the contrary side, so yt in short time the whole towne lay together by the eares in the middle of the Church, which when Scoggin perceiued he went his way out of the village and came no more there.

It should be said at once that the compiler of the jests in the 1613 edition pretends that he has translated his book from French.

[3] *Modern Language Review*, XVI (1921), 120 ff.

On page one appears the heading: *Certaine Merrie Iestes of Scoggin translated out of French.* This is fiction, we may be sure, and we can pass it over with the same laughter,—or scorn, if Scogan happens to be too elemental for us,—which we accord the other jests. The compiler plainly thought to add authority to these Continental adventures of Scogan by pretending that they were originally recorded in French, but there is not the slightest evidence of a French original anywhere, and Scogan's vogue has always been of the English English. Moreover, the game is given away by the duplication in the 1613 edition of four jests in the unquestionably English 1626 edition, which of itself is probably only a copy of a much earlier edition.[4] The English setting becomes French with the greatest ease.

And so with some assurance we can guess that this tale of the priest and his one-eyed lemman describes an English play. The writer obviously considers himself much removed from the time, for he makes pointed reference to the earlier and more superstitious times which loved Easter plays. His violent anti-Popery proves the author to have belonged to Protestant England, but he probably reworked a jest handed down in folk-lore from previous generations. The earliest certain date for any of *Scoggins Jests* is 1565-6, when a collection now unknown was licensed for printing.[5] However, the jests undoubtedly circulated in some form long before this, and, as I have tried to show at length elsewhere, Scoggin the jester was probably the same Scogan who lived in Chaucer's time and appears in Chaucer's *Envoy*.[6]

I think then that Scogan's jest of the Easter play makes very probable the existence in England, say during the early fifteenth century, of such a version as is described, but even if the setting is really French, this slovenly told little story is full of interest. Chambers says:[7] "It must be borne in mind that the *Quem quaeritis* remained imperfectly detached from the liturgy, out of which it arose. The performers were priests, or nuns, and choir-boys." But in Scogan's play the secularization seems to have gone so far that some of the parts at least were played by townspeople. Still

[4] *Modern Language Review*, XVI, 123, note.
[5] Arber's *Transcript*, I, 134.
[6] *Modern Language Review*, XVI, 120 ff., as noted above.
[7] Work cited, II, 35.

more interesting, the women's parts were played by men. The priest's lemman gets the part of the angel only because the simple fellows of the town were not lettered enough to take it. The brief sketch of the audience assembled in the church to see the play and falling into a fight over it is a breath of reality.

Because of the hit or miss fashion in which the jest is told, perhaps after all the most dependable and significant thing about it is the life-like picture of a priest with commendable artistic impulses, though unpraiseworthy morals, working up an Easter drama among parishioners neither artistic nor lettered. It must have happened so pretty often. Even though he is mediæval in morals, the priest is vividly like an earnest young rector of today getting up church theatricals. The whole story has a human touch which the Latin texts of the liturgical drama do not share.

Washington and Lee University. WILLARD FARNHAM.

REVIEWS

Prepositional Phrases of Asseveration and Adjuration in Old and Middle French. By OLIVER TOWLES. Paris: Champion, 1920. x + 157 pp.

In his "Introduction" (pp. 7-10), the author of this Johns Hopkins dissertation summarizes the general principles involved in the use of invocatory formulas, and delimits the scope of his investigation. By confining his attention to "the invocation of objects of reverence and love by means of a phrase consisting of an introductory preposition plus the name of the object invoked," he excludes the consideration of such forms as *si m'ait dieu, le diable m'emporte,* etc. He further excludes prepositional phrases based on the name of some abstract quality (e. g., *par amour*), except when "as the result of the presence of the possessive pronoun (e. g., *par ma foi*), the abstraction seems to be made definite, personified and invoked." Exclamatory or interjectional forms are included only "where invocations in normal adjurative or asseverative forms, or in forms derived from them, are used interjectionally." [1]

[1] What evidence is there that *beau Dieu, benoît Dieu* (p. 20), each of

As compared with the earlier dissertations of Tolle [2] and Busch,[3] the present study is less comprehensive from the point of view of the syntactic function of the formulas under consideration. Its chronological scope is more restricted than that of Zöckler's monograph,[4] which deals with the entire French period. On the other hand, within the definite limits which Mr. Towles has prescribed for himself, he has drawn upon a wider range of sources and has given us a more complete and better-ordered collection of material than any of his predecessors had done.

The list of texts from which the material is drawn includes seventy-eight titles covering the period from the *St. Léger* down to the middle of the sixteenth century and representing the various literary genres: hagiographic and didactic poetry, chansons de geste, courtly epic, the *Roman de Renart,* fabliaux, lyric, religious and profane drama, historical and other narrative prose. As secondary sources, the author names the German monographs abovementioned, Du Cange, Godefroy, and Langlois's *Table des noms propres.*

The body of the dissertation (pp. 11-149) consists of a list of the oath-forms classified according to the objects invoked: A) religious objects (Christian and pagan), B) objects pertaining to the speaker, the person addressed or the person referred to (including abstract attributes, material attributes, and persons bearing a relation of some sort to the speaker, the person addressed or the person referred to), C) miscellaneous objects. Religious oaths and invocations of objects of personal reverence occur with almost equal frequency, but the former are far superior to the latter in variety of form (at least half the examples of the latter group invoke *la foi* or *l'âme*); there are less than thirty invocations of miscellaneous objects. As one might expect, the greatest variety is found in the Christian objects of invocation.

There are a number of cases where Mr. Towles's classification of individual examples might be open to question. So, p. 30,

which occurs only once and without preposition, are derived from prepositional forms (cf. the statement on p. 10, note)?

[2] *Das Betheuern und Beschwören in der altromanischen Poesie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der französischen,* Erlangen, 1883.

[3] *Über die Betheuerungs- und Beschwörungsformeln in den Miracles de Notre Dame par personnages,* Marburg, 1886.

[4] *Die Beteuerungsformeln im Französischen,* Leipzig, 1906.

should not "God the Saviour" be under "God the Son" rather than under "God the Father"?—P. 50, might not *la mort* be included among "abstractions relating to the Passion of Christ" (pp. 100-101, along with *les angoisses,* etc.) rather than under "indirect invocation [of Christ] through the medium of some attribute"?—P. 66, why does *par seint Martir* appear under "saints as a class or in groups"?—P. 99, should not Mary Magdalen and Mary the Egyptian be listed under "saints"?—P. 110, *foi que je doi saint Israel* and *par sainte* [read *saint*] *Spire de Corbueil* are probably invocations of saints rather than of "holy places" (under "miscellaneous holy material objects").[5] These cases of possibly inexact classification are unimportant, however, since there is a good index (pp. 151-156), in which the various oath-forms are listed alphabetically. This index is especially welcome in view of the fact that Tolle's dissertation (which, of the three earlier monographs, most nearly covered the period treated in the present study) has neither an index nor a table of contents.

Although the author modestly states in his preface that he has merely given a classified list of the forms he has found, he has really done more than that, since we find scattered through the volume many illuminating observations in regard to the relative frequency of occurrence of the different forms and types of oaths at the various periods and in the various types of literature (often the forms occur within quite definite literary and chronological limits), and in regard to their functions and values, as asseverative or adjurative, mild or emphatic, serious or frivolous. These are matters of detail which, unfortunately, can hardly be summarized within the limits of a brief review.

A few words may be said concerning the completeness and accuracy of Mr. Towles's citations. In the case of a number of frequently recurring forms, the indication "etc." shows that the list of examples quoted and referred to is not exhaustive. Else-

[5] In several instances, the same example should have been quoted or referred to under two different rubrics: *par le bon Dieu poissant* (p. 20, s. v. *bon*) should also appear p. 24, s. v. *dieu le puissant; par le grand Dieu misericors* (p. 24, s. v. *dieu miséricordieux*) should also appear p. 20, s. v. *grand; foi que doi Deu et sa vertu* (p. 35, s. v. *vertu*) should also appear pp. 17-18, s. v. *foi que dois Dieu; Mere de Diou! La Coronade!* (p. 57, s. v. *mère de Dieu*) should also appear p. 55, s. v. *couronnée.*

where, unless there is indication to the contrary, one would assume that the author has listed all the examples he has found of the formula in question. One is therefore surprised at the omission of certain examples which had previously been quoted by Tolle and Zöckler and which occur in texts included in Mr. Towles's bibliography.[6] For instance, additional examples of the invocation of "saints individually" should have been included in a number of cases where Mr. Towles expressly states that only one example has been found or that the form is "very rare": *Ste. Avie* (Zöckler, p. 108), *St. Benoît* (Zöckler, p. 100), *St. François* (Zöckler, p. 102), *St. Sulpice* (Zöckler, p. 107). Examples occur in Mr. Towles's texts of oaths by the following saints who do not figure in his list: *St. Aignan* (Zöckler, p. 100), *St. Blanchart de Vitré* (Zöckler, p. 108), *St. Guineman* (Tolle, p. 39), *Ste. Marande* (Zöckler, p. 110), *St. Nythier* (Zöckler, p. 106), *St. Yzaye* (Tolle, p. 39).

On the other hand, the author has included one example, at least, which is more than doubtful. P. 47, s. v. *le cœur* [de Dieu], he states that his last example of the oath is in Villon, and refers to the Longnon edition of 1911, p. 44. *Par cuer,* in this passage (*Test.,* v. 988), is surely not an oath.

Mr. Towles's quotations and references, so far as verified by the reviewer, appear to be fairly accurate. Sometimes, indeed, the spelling is not exactly that of the text.[8] The following inaccurate references have been noted: p. 27, l. 19, the reference to *H. Bord.* should be "756" (not "766"); p. 57, n. 10, read "Ch. lyon, 4064" (not "4506"); p. 59, l. 5, read "Vill., 42" (not "57"); p. 128, l. 22, read "Ch. lyon, 1269" (not "268"); p. 138, l. 3,

[6] In some cases, of course, the discrepancy is due to the fact that Mr. Towles made use of an edition other than that used by his predecessor. Thus, the example of *Saint Vaas* cited by Tolle (p. 39) from *Aliscans* occurs only as a variant in the edition used by Mr. Towles. In this connection, it may be regretted that the author did not make use of the variant readings in the Marty-Laveaux edition of Rabelais, which would have enabled him to add a considerable number of interesting forms (esp. from *Gargantua,* Ch. 17, instead of the simple *par saincte Mamye*).

[7] Cf. *Test.,* v. 35, P. Champion, *François Villon,* II, p. 115, note, and L. Foulet, *Romania,* XLVII, pp. 582-584.

[8] E. g., p. 25, l. 12, the text has *cuer,* not *cueur;* p. 149, l. 6, the text has *coroné,* not *queroné.* Several other examples, which could easily be multiplied, are included below under typographical errors.

read "Rol., 3954" (not "953"); p. 144, n. 1, read "Par. Duch., 1235" (not "1253"); p. 149, l. 12, read "Vill., 63" (not "1585," since the other references to Villon are page-references). P. 143, n. 1, we read: "*Pour l'amour de* —, Alex., XIII." As the only edition of the *Alexis* listed in Mr. Towles's bibliography is G. Paris's edition of 1903, one would naturally suppose this to be a reference to strophe XIII. No such example occurs in this strophe, though similar formulas are to be found in vv. 152, 220, 223 and 230. There has perhaps been confusion with an example quoted by Tolle, p. 25: "Et por l'amor Alexis ten enfant: St. Alex. XIII[e] 305, 882," which refers, not to strophe XIII of the eleventh-century poem, but to v. 882 (or rather 883) of the thirteenth-century rhymed redaction included by G. Paris in his large 1872 edition (p. 305).[9]

PERCIVAL B. FAY.

University of California.

The Cid Theme in France in 1600, Minneapolis: Pioneer Printers, 1920, 16 pp.; *The Purpose of Corneille's Cid,* by G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK. Minneapolis: Pioneer Printers, 1921, 39 pp.[1]

In the first of these brochures Dr. van Roosbroeck shows that the plot of an early French novel, *La hayne et l'amour d'Arnoul et de Clairemonde* (Paris, Du Breuil, 1600), by a certain Antoine

[9] The following are evidently slips or misprints: p. ix, l. 15, "personnages" (same error, p. 128, l. 16); p. 4, l. 18, "Densusiano"; p. 7, chapter-heading, "PRINCIPILES"; p. 10, l. 3, "interjectionnal"; p. 16, l. 3, "ellypsis"; p. 19, l. 18, "form the oath" (read "form of the oath"); p. 27, l. 19, "*soiés*" (read "*soies*"); p. 43, l. 1, "appelative"; p. 46, l. 20, "fifteenth centuries" (read "fifteenth and sixteenth centuries"); p. 51, l. 13, "*foi*" (read "*foie*"); p. 71, l. 2, "*vin*" (read "*vint*"); p. 82, l. 16, "fictitions"; p. 103, l. 14, "*le*" (read "*la*"); p. 107, l. 1, "pâtenôtre"; p. 126, l. 20, "*ont*" (read "*out*"); p. 134, l. 3, "Absractions"; p. 139, l. 19, "*mourent*" (read "*mourut*"); p. 140, l. 23, "*feroiz*" (read "*seroiz*"); p. 143, l. 2 from bottom, note "3" (read "5"); p. 144, n. 1, "campanions"; p. 152, l. 17, "*dents de Saint-*" (read "*dent de Saint-*").

[1] A third pamphlet, entitled *The Genesis of Corneille's Mélite* has also been printed. As it has been withdrawn from sale on account of numerous typographical errors and as whatever it contains of value will be published subsequently, it is unnecessary to review it at this time.

Du Périer, is very much like that of the *Cid,* for in it a young man kills in a duel the father of a girl who, while seeking vengeance for this deed, falls in love with her father's murderer. She has Chimène's moral struggle between love and duty, a duel is fought for her, her lover offers her his sword that she may kill him with it, and she finally yields to his courtship. All of these similarities and more are also found in Corneille's Spanish source, but Dr. van Roosbroeck thinks that Du Périer's analysis of love, subtler and more emphasized than de Castro's, may have suggested to Corneille the idea of stressing moral strife rather than external action. As to the relation between de Castro and Du Périer he concludes that there are only two possible theories, either that de Castro was influenced by Du Périer, or that there was a common source, probably Spanish. He very properly considers the second the more likely to be true. In any case it is interesting to note that the story which was dramatized by de Castro and Corneille appeared in France before either of them wrote.

The Purpose of Corneille's Cid has a more ambitious theme. In it Dr. van Roosebroeck urges that many problems connected with the *Cid*—its success despite the fact that it appeared with its Spanish hero at a time when France and Spain were at war, the ennoblement of Corneille's father in January, 1637, the hostility of Richelieu, Corneille's turning to heroic characterization—can be solved "by the identification of an *allusion* to the queen of France, Anne of Austria, in the Chimène of Corneille's play." He brings forward as evidence the facts that the government of Richelieu was unpopular at the time that Corneille wrote the *Cid,* that the queen's party was pro-Spanish and desirous to oppose the Cardinal in every possible way, that de Châlons, who is said to have suggested the subject to Corneille, was secretary to Anne of Austria, and that the situation of the queen, daughter of the King of Spain and wife of the King of France, was similar to that of Chimène, obliged to demand that her lover be put to death for killing her father. Now there is no doubt about the Spanish party and its hostility to Richelieu, but the evidence that de Châlons, barely twenty-one at the time, suggested to Corneille the reading of de Castro is extremely weak, for it is based on a statement made by de Beauchamps nearly a century later in a short passage that contains at least two errors.[2]

[2] De Beauchamps refers to this youth as being "dans sa vieillesse" and

But even if we admit that Corneille's attention was called to a Spanish play by a follower of Anne of Austria, how does that prove that she was the model for Chimène? The parallel is really not very striking. It is a question in the play of two families, not of two nations, the heroine is not yet married, through most of the play she fights against her lover, yielding only at the end and then tacitly. It would have been a dubious compliment to the queen to imply that through most of the war she was working against her husband's interests and yielded only after having tried almost every means in her power to have him put to death.[3]

But there is a still stronger objection to be made. Dr. van Roosbroeck holds that the success of the *Cid* was largely due to the discovery of this parallel by the Parisian theater-goers. How is it then that no reference was made to the fact in the seventeenth century? He sees the difficulty and seeks to avoid it by a reference to Sorel, who explained Richelieu's dislike of the *Cid* and approval of Scudéry's *Amour tyrannique* on the ground that "dans le premier il y avoit quelques paroles qui choquoient les grands Ministres, et dans l'autre il y en avoit qui exaltoient le pouvoir absolu des Roys, mesmes sur leurs plus proches." Dr. van Roosbroeck adds (p. 13), "The text makes it perfectly clear that the Mémoires, from which Sorel drew his information, meant that Richelieu condemned the *Cid* and praised the *Amour Tirannique* because of the allusions which these plays contain to the relations between the queen, Anne of Austria, and the king, Louis XIII." Not at all. "Sur leurs plus proches" refers to Scudéry's play only. The words that shocked the Cardinal can be easily identified with some of the lines spoken by Chimène's father and by Don Sanche. I quite agree with Dr. van Roosbroeck that the fact that there is a duel in the *Cid* did not set Richelieu against the play,

makes him secretary to the queen mother, which must mean Marie de Médicis, for Dr. van Roosbroeck's ingenious argument that de Beauchamps was referring to the "latest 'Reine Mère' he knew himself, Anne of Austria" will hardly carry conviction if one realizes that de Beauchamps wrote over sixty years after the death of Anne, at a time when her son Louis XIV had ceased to reign.

[3] Mr. Chinard calls my attention to the fact that a real parallel to the situation of Anne is to be found, not in the *Cid*, but in *Horace*, where Sabine is married to a man who is fighting against her family and her nation.

but he may well have objected to lines that expressed just the point of view of the revolting nobles against whom he was directing much of his energy. Compare, for instance, lines 157, 158:

> Pour grands que soient les rois, ils sont ce que nous sommes
> Ils peuvent se tromper comme les autres hommes;

or line 366,

> Désobéir un peu n'est pas un si grand crime;

or line 378,

> Tout l'État périra, s'il faut que je périsse.[4]

There is no reason, then, to suppose that Sorel had in mind an identification of Chimène and Anne of Austria. Apparently he, like Corneille's other contemporaries, knew nothing of this parallel,[5] or did not think it worth reporting. How then could it have exerted any real influence upon the play's success?

The interesting question which Dr. van Roosbroeck raises as to how a Spanish hero could be popular in France in 1636-1637 is certainly not explained by his suggestion that a Spanish clique at court favored the *Cid*. Indeed the only conclusions to be drawn are that war made nations less hostile in the seventeenth century than it does to-day and that Rodrigue was looked upon less as a Spaniard than as the representative of christendom in its wars with the Mohammedan world, still a subject of interest in France, where Father Joseph had sought not long before to organize a crusade against the Turks.[6]

Finally this pamphlet takes up the vexed question of Richelieu's attitude towards the *Cid*. The author finds that it was not at first unfavorable, but became so when the Cardinal discovered the secret correspondence between Anne of Austria and the Spanish court. Now this is an interesting hypothesis and may conceivably be correct, but to prove it one must show that the discovery of the queen's intrigue preceded Richelieu's hostility to the play. "It is only by the end of July 1637," writes Dr. van Roosbroeck,

[4] Cf. also lines 380-382 and 583-592.

[5] If they had known of it, could Corneille have written in his *Lettre apologétique*, "vous avez traisté la pauvre Chimène d'impudique, de prostituée, de parricide"?

[6] Cf. L. Dedouvres, *le Père Joseph polémiste*, Paris, Picard, 1895, pp. 35 *seq.*

"that Richelieu showed any real interest in the Academy's criticism of the *Cid*," but his only proof of this is contained in a letter of that date cited by Professor Searles,[7] which shows only that Richelieu was then interested in the matter, *not* that his interest in it had just begun. Indeed this interest may have been felt as early as the latter part of June. On the other hand our earliest date that has to do with the discovery of the queen's correspondence with the enemy is August 11 when the arrest of her *portemanteau*, La Porte, was ordered.[8] It would seem, therefore, that Richelieu's interest in having the *Cid* condemned began before the discovery of the queen's treachery. Certainly the contrary is far from being established. As a matter of fact, I doubt very much if Richelieu felt any real enmity to Corneille or the *Cid*. He wished to have his Academy settle the famous literary quarrel simply because he wished to direct various forms of national activity, literary as well as political or religious.

I cannot, then, accept Dr. van Roosbroeck's hypothesis, but this does not mean that his pamphlet is without value. On the contrary, his work gives evidence of great industry and ingenuity. His information is extensive and unusual. He does not convince me, but he makes me think. That is why I believe that this brochure should be read by all who are interested in seventeenth-century plays.

H. Carrington Lancaster.

Goethe über seine Dichtungen. Versuch einer Sammlung aller Äusserungen des Dichters über seine poetischen Werke von Prof. Dr. Hans Gerhard Gräf. Frankfurt a. M.: Literarische Anstalt Rütten & Loening, 1903-14, 9 volumes:

Erster Theil: Die epischen Dichtungen. Erster Band, 1901 (*Achilleis—Wahlverwandtschaften*). Zweiter Band, 1902 (*Werther—Wilhelm Meister,* Indexes).

Zweiter Theil: Die dramatischen Dichtungen. Erster Band, 1903 (*Amine—Fastnachtspiel*). Zweiter Band, 1904 (*Faust—Geschwister*). Dritter Band, 1906 (*Götter, Helden u. Wieland*

[7] *R. H. L.*, 1914, p. 359.

[8] Richelieu, *Mémoires*, Paris, Foucault, 1823, x, 195.

Neueröffnetes moralisch-politisches Puppenspiel). Vierter Band, 1908 (*Paläophron u. Neoterpe—Ynkle u. Jariko,* Indexes).

Dritter Theil: Die lyrischen Dichtungen. Erster Band, 1912 (1756-1814). Zweiter Band, 1. Hälfte, 1914 (1815-26). Zweiter Band, 2. Hälfte, 1914 (1826-32, Tables, Indexes).

The first four volumes of Gräf's monumental work were reviewed in this periodical by Adolph Gerber,[1] but various circumstances combined have hitherto prevented corresponding notice of the remaining five volumes, the last issued in Dec. 1914. It is now too late to review them in detail, even if that were profitable with a work consisting of a truly vast number of data.

To those who have once consulted Gräf's work it requires no further recommendation. Others will be interested to know that it consists of a most careful and scholarly collection, chronologically arranged, of *all* of Goethe's scattered utterances and notes, however slight, referring to each of his works, Epic, Dramatic and Lyric, with concise explanatory comment whenever necessary, and with full indexes to each of these three divisions. There are also numerous tables of much interest and value, and innumerable cross-references throughout. As indicated in brackets above, Gräf takes up the Epic and Dramatic works in the alphabetical order of their titles in these two groups, but for the Lyrics he very properly adopts a single chronological order throughout the whole group. The tables to the Lyrics show clearly the chronological sequence of all the poems, and also just which poems appear in Goethe's various lists and collections.

Of course it was not thought necessary to reprint in full under each work separately a passage referring to several works at once. In such cases cross-references amply suffice. The indexes to the references to each work are printed at the end of the group, Epic, Dramatic or Lyric. Except for these cross-references and indexes each volume is practically complete in itself, and each may accordingly be purchased separately.

The Index for each work collects its: 1. *Quellen;* 2. *Orte;* 3. *Briefe* etc. (including letters from others than Goethe himself);

[1] I, June 1901; II, Nov. 1902; III and IV, May 1905.

4. *Tagebücher;* 5. *Gespräche;* 6. *Entstehung;* 7. *Drucke;* 8. *Wirkung* (including translations); 9. *Einzelnheiten* (including references to particular parts of the work in question).

The various MSS. and editions of each work, Epic or Dramatic, are duly described on the first pages relating to it. This proved impracticable in the case of Lyrics; but their first appearance in print and place in the Weimar edition are precisely indicated in the elaborate but clear Index of first lines, titles, persons and places in the last volume.

Gräf includes (VI, Anhang II) Goethe's share in Iffland's *Die Hagestolzen,* Schikaneder's (& Giesecke's) *Die Zauberflöte,* and Schiller's *Wallenstein* and *Demetrius,* but all *translations* are rigidly excluded. Hence it may be noted that the well-known quatrain "Liegt dir Gestern klar und offen" (Gräf IX, 791, 30 & 1123) has very recently been discovered to be in fact a paraphrase from Maucroix, instead of some otherwise unknown "Maucroux"'s having translated Goethe's lines into French.[2]

One further little *Nachtrag* may be welcome: The original autograph MS., sent to William Fraser, of Goethe's well-known poem *Den funfzehn Englischen Freunden* (cf. Gräf IX, 856) to thank Carlyle and the others for the handsome seal presented to Goethe for his (last) birthday in 1831, has been privately printed with notes, as No. 2 (1916) of *Facsimiles and Reproductions of Unique or Rare Items from The William A. Speck Collection of Goethiana in Yale University Library.* A second little autograph MS. wrongly reading *Den neunzehn* etc. as first printed in *Chaos,* 1831, Vol. II, no. 6, is in my own possession.

The value of such a work as Gräf's depends largely on its completeness and its accuracy—both of which in this case are indeed very extraordinary. I have used these volumes extremely often, but do not remember ever noticing a single omission of material accessible to Gräf, or any inaccuracy.[3]

[2] *Am. Journ. of Philology* XLI, 379-383 (1920). The French verses are not in the 1775 edition of Voltaire.

[3] The nearest approach to an error is in the brief preface to Vol. VI (Drama IV), 1908: ". . . das Register . . . um einen treffenden Vergleich Carlyles zu gebrauchen, das Auge des Polyphem." Carlyle had really said: "A library is not worth anything without a catalogue—it is a Polyphemus without any eye in his head." Cf. *Report of the Commis-*

Though this great work is necessarily full of minute detail it is of so much interest apart from mere questions of dry facts, that even Herman Grimm, the sworn enemy of mere fact, himself welcomed it enthusiastically (*Deutsche Rundschau,* Dec. 1900). Gräf's long and most conscientious and self-effacing labor certainly deserves our lasting gratitude. For all serious students of Goethe's works Gräf's volumes have been universally admitted to be literally indispensable.

Leonard L. Mackall.

Savannah, Ga.

Scott and Scandinavian Literature. By Paul R. Lieder. Smith College Studies in Modern Languages. Northampton, Mass., 1920.

In 1901, the very readable dissertation of Conrad Nordby, on *The Influence of Old Norse Literature on English Literature,* was published posthumously in the Columbia University Germanic series. The book was sketchy in parts, but the author no doubt would have filled in various gaps if he had lived. On the whole, however, Nordby correctly sensed this exotic influence and rightly estimated each poet's reaction to it.

Nordby's chapter on Sir Walter Scott, covering as it does only two pages, is particularly incomplete. Accordingly, the detailed study of this specific subject, made by Professor Lieder, is to be hailed as a welcome supplement.

Scott, in the manner of the antiquarians of the day, gives in his notes a large number of references to his sources. Professor Lieder has not added to these, but he proves conclusively by the citation of pertinent passages, that Scott relied for the most part on the Latin work of the learned Bartholinus,[1] from which Gray

sioners apptd. to inquire into . . . the British Museum (London 1850), p. 282. But Gräf himself long ago noticed this slight slip of memory. It is understood that Gräf is now working on a supplementary volume of *Nachträge,* to embody material which has become available since the corresponding portions of his work were printed.

[1] Thomae Bartholini Thomae Filii *Antiquitatum Danicarum de Causis Contemptae a Danis adhuc Gentilibus Mortis Libri Tres ex vetustis Codicibus et Monumentis hactenus inceditis congesti,* Hafniae. MDCLXXXIX.

and other English poets of that day also drew their one-sidedly gloomy interpretation of Old Norse life. A cursory turning of the pages of Bartholinus' massive tome furnishes two more striking parallels: In the *Pirate,* Scott has one of the characters ask, "Or was it the tomb of some Scandinavian chief, interred with his arms and his wealth, perhaps also with his immolated wife?"[2] This remark may have been based on the following statements of Bartholinus: "Pecunia cum defunctis simul sepulta" (Cap. ix), "Arma cum mortuis simul cremata et sepulta" (*l. c.* p. 562), "Conjuges cum maritis mortuis concrematae et consepultae" (*l. c.* p. 499). The very heading of Caput I, "Exempla Danorum, qui intrepidi, immo ridentes ad mortem ibant," probably suggested the references to the heroes "smiling in death" in the *Letter in Verse to the Duke of Buccleugh,*[3] the *Antiquary,*[4] and the *Pirate.*[5]

In many instances, when more direct sources are cited, the writer shows by internal evidence that the poet simply culled his citations from the Latin of Bartholinus. He has established incontrovertibly, that wherever Bartholinus gives the Old Norse and its Latin translation in parallel passages, Scott invariably chose the language which was easiest for him to translate, *i. e.* Latin (p. 16), and that wherever an English translation was available beside a Latin one, he apparently chose the English version (p. 21). An inspection of Sharon Turner, *History of the Anglo-Saxons,* 1799-1801, might have furnished some interesting material, as Scott acknowledged his indebtedness to this work in a letter to Ellis, "I have derived much information from Turner; he combines the knowledge of the Welsh and *northern authorities.*"[6]

Professor Lieder, as well as Nordby, overestimates the significance of Scott's review of Herbert's *Translations.*[7] Nordby had gone so far as to award to Scott the distinction of having first

[2] Sir Walter Scott, *Waverley Novels,* Andrew Lang Edition, Boston, 1892, XVIII, 303.

[3] J. G. Lockhart, *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott, Bart.,* Boston, IV, 161.

[4] *Waverley Novels,* III, ii, 110.

[5] *Waverley Novels,* XVIII, 230.

[6] Lockhart, ii, 80.

[7] W. Herbert, *Translations from the German, Danish and Seleet Ieelandie Poetry. Translated from the Originals with Notes,* London, 1804-6. Reviewed in *Edinburgh Review,* vol. 9, 211.

pointed out to English readers the force of the negative contractions in Old Norse;[8] and on the face of it, Scott seems to betray a minute acquaintance with the earlier English translators of Icelandic poetry. Thus he mentions the limitations and blunders of Gray, Mason, Bishop Percy and Amos Cottle. A reference to the Announcement and Notes to Herbert's volumes would have revealed the fact that these strictures as well as most of the other essential points of Scott's review were simply taken over from them and that Scott's own contributions are insignificant.[9] Accordingly, when Professor Lieder sums up this particular discussion with the words, "this review suggests how widely, and with what interest, Scott had read the most important English translators of Scandinavian literature; it shows, too, a certain keenness, or at least a scholarly exactitude, in his judgment of them" (p. 46), he attributes to Scott a far more detailed knowledge of these things than the facts warrant.

Similarly, many of the Notes to the *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border,* from which Professor Lieder quotes frequently, were furnished to Scott by others. So for example, in the *Letters on Demonology* Scott refers to the *Essay on the Fairy Superstition*[10] and states that "many of the materials were contributed by Dr. Leyden, and the whole brought into the present form by the author."[11] In the *Introductory Remarks on Popular Poetry,* prefixed to the later editions of the *Minstrelsy,*[12] and in Note K to the *Lady of the Lake,* he speaks appreciatingly of Robert Jamieson's "extensive acquaintance with the Scandinavian literature" and of his indebtedness to him. Indeed, Scott's indebtedness to Jamieson must have been considerable, for he anonymously edited a collection of translations for him. In the unsigned announce-

[8] Nordby, 13.

[9] Cf. Herbert, *Part Second,* pp. viii, 9, 47, 49, 54, and *Part Third* (misprinted as *Part Second*), p. 53 for a discussion of all the translators mentioned by Scott. In *Part Second,* p. 118, is explained the negative force of the suffix *at.*

[10] *Introduction to the Tale of Tamlane. On the Fairies of Popular Superstition* in *Poetical Works* of Sir Walter Scott, Bart., Edinburgh, 1833, II, 255.

[11] New York, 1855, Note, p. 119.

[12] Poetical Works, I, 80.

ment of Jamieson's book, there is printed a letter addressed by the translator to the editor, which ends with "kindest remembrances to *Mrs. Scott and family.*" [13]

The present author is the first to make use of the Catalogue of Scott's Library, published in 1838. But the list, which he gives of works dealing with Scandinavian material, could have been made far more imposing by the addition of at least fifty titles. Some of the most important works which were overlooked are:

Resenius, P. J., *Snorronis Edda Islandorum,* 1665-73.
Thorsten, *Vikings-sons Saga,* Upsala, 1680.
Peringskiöld, J., *Heims-Kringla,* Holm., 1679.
Arius Thorgilsi Filius, *Libellus de Islandia — Islandinga Bok dictus,* 1733.
Sofrensen, Andres, *Kaempe Viser,* Copenh., 1695.
Peringskiöld, J., *Wilkina Saga,* Stockholm, 1715 (with MSS. Notes by Sir Walter Scott).
Björner, A. J., *Nordiska Kampe Datur,* Stockholm, 1737.
Suhmius, *Kristni Saga,* Hafn., 1773.
Thorlacius, *Egils Saga,* Havn., 1809.
Müller, P. E., *Sagabibliothek,* Kjöb., 1817-20.
Rafn, C. C., *Jomsvikinga Saga,* Kjöb., 1824.
Thorkelin, G. J., *Laxdaela Saga,* Hafn., 1826.

On the other hand, the significance of these titles must not be overestimated, as Scott's library contained over 50,000 volumes and he scarcely could have consulted all the books he possessed.

For the earliest interest in things Scandinavian, Professor Lieder failed to note the pertinent statement of Lockhart, that "on the fourth of January, 1791, he (Scott) was admitted as a member of the Speculative Society and that on the eleventh of December he read an essay *on the Origin of the Scandinavian Mythology.*" [14]

In the discussion of the more intimate knowledge and interest in Scandinavian literature on the part of the Germans of this time (p. 34, note 85), the reader might have been reminded of the fact that Henry Weber, the co-editor of *Illustrations of Northern Antiquities,* was "a poor German scholar, who escaping to this country in 1804, from misfortunes in his own, excited Scott's

[13] Robert Jamieson, *Popular Ballads and Songs,* Edinburgh, 1806, II, 98.
[14] Lockhart, I, 207.

compassion, and was thenceforth furnished."[15] Weber thus undoubtedly facilitated for the poet the acquaintance with this vast field of antiquarian research.

On the basis of very fragmentary evidence, Nordby had summed up Scott's position with regard to things Scandinavian with a remarkable degree of intuition. The interest in Professor Lieder's study lies in its completeness. It seems, therefore, all the more regrettable that he did not at least mention the *Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft* of 1830, which contain a large number of additional references to Old Norse superstitions, particularly fairies, dwarfs, and ghosts.

FREDERICK W. J. HEUSER.

Columbia University.

CORRESPONDENCE

CORNEILLE'S RELATIONS WITH LOUIS PETIT

Various authors have touched upon the friendly relations of P. Corneille with Louis Petit, the satirical poet of Rouen (1614?-1695). Although the diversity between their kinds of talent, between Corneille's tragic loftiness and Petit's cool-headed satire, was marked, Corneille seems to have had real esteem for his friend's poetical powers and to have addressed to him an exhortation to undertake more ambitious work than his occasional amorous verse and his satires. Petit replied with a poem to Corneille, under the pastoral disguise of Damon, in which he defended his free and easy manner and stressed his disdain of literary glory.[1]

The satirical works of Louis Petit are in the vein of the other satirical poets of seventeenth century Normandy: Courval-Sonnet, Jean Auvray, Robert Angot, David Ferrand, the principal author of *La Muse Normande,* etc. He began to publish only at the end of his career. In 1686, he printed his *Discours satyriques et moraux, ou Satyres générales* (Rouen, 1686), which was reprinted,

[15] Lockhart, IV. 9.

[1] Cf. Goujet, *Bibliothèque Françoise,* XVIII, 230—*Nouv. Biographie Didot.*—*Notice* by A. Chassant in *La Muse Normande de Louis Petit,* Rouen, 1853.—*Notice* by Ol. de Gourcuff in *Les Satires de Louis Petit,* Paris, 1883.—*Notice* by P. Duputel in *Précis de l'académie de Rouen,* 1827.—*Nouvelles de la République des Lettres,* May, 1687.—Oursel, *Biographie Normande.*—Lebreton, *Biographie Rouennaise.*—Fred. Lachèvre, *Bibliographie des Recueils Collectifs,* II, 413.—A. van Bever, *Les Poètes du Terroir,* III, 427 etc.

with a changed title, as *Le nouveau Juvenal satyrique, pour la réformation des mœurs et des abus de notre siècle* (Utrecht, 1716). There exists also a modern reprint of the same text with the title: *Les satires de Louis Petit* (Paris, Jouaust, 1883). Again the same satires, with the exception of the first, are found, with variants and additions, in a volume published in 1713: *Les Oeuvres diverses du sieur D**** (Paris, no publisher given). Fred. Lachèvre is inclined to believe that all the poems appearing in this volume are by Louis Petit.[2] His only other volume published during his lifetime is the *Dialogues satyriques et moraux* (In prose, Paris, 1686 and Paris, Amsterdam, 1688).

In 1853, Alph. Chassant studied a manuscript volume of Louis Petit's unpublished poems, which, at that time, belonged to Leopold Marcel, notary at Louviers, and which now seems lost. Since it was dated 1658, it contained evidently his early verse, written before P. Corneille left Rouen for Paris, in 1662. It is clearly to this poetry of his youth that he refers in the first *satire* of his *Discours satyriques et moraux ou Satyres générales* (1686):

> Jusqu' icy de l'amour j'ay chanté les tendresses
> Dans mille vers badins à de jeunes maîtresses;
> Mais ma muse aujourd'huy prend d'autres sentiments
> Qui s'accorderont mieux avec mes cheveux blancs.

Alph. Chassant published a few of the poems, most of them in "patois Normand" as: *La Muse Normande de Louis Petit de Rouen, en patois Normand* (Rouen, 1853). From his description of the manuscript it results that it contained exactly the kind of amorous and capricious verse to which Petit referred as constituting his early work. Some of it may have appeared in the *Recueils* of the time, to which he contributed.[3]

About L. Petit's relations with P. Corneille the abbé Goujet states: "Il estoit l' ami particulier de Pierre Corneille, et il fut l' éditeur de ses pièces de Théatre, reimprimées à Rouen chez Lallemant. Corneille ayant quitté Rouen, M. Petit alla aussi à Paris, et il y fut très assidu à l' Hôtel de Rambouillet, où il se fit aimer et estimer."[4] This example of constant friendship was taken over by various *Notices* on Louis Petit, generally with a few additional embellishments. Alph. Chassant says that after Corneille's death, in 1684, the Parisian drawing-rooms lost their attraction for Louis Petit and that he returned to Rouen.

Yet the information given by the abbé Goujet is contradicted by the *Au Lecteur* of Petit's second book, the *Dialogues satyriques et moraux*. There Petit explains: "Je n' ay donc qu' un petit

[2] *Bibliographie des Recueils coll.*, II, 414.
[3] Fred. Lachèvre, *op. cit.*
[4] *Biblioth. Franç.*, XVIII, p. 232.

mot à vous dire de moy; c'est qu' il y a long-temps que je ne suis plus jeune, et que depuis plus de vingt-cinq ans j' ay toujours respiré l' air d' une Province où l' on ne se pique pas de la dernière politesse de la Langue. Ainsi je vous demande un peu d'indulgence pour mon stile." Since Louis Petit wrote this in 1686, he must have lived at Rouen from before 1661 to 1686 and later; and these dates include exactly the time that he is supposed to have followed Corneille to Paris, from 1662 to 1684. Besides, it is at least very doubtful that Louis Petit, after 1662, had occasion to be so much in evidence at the Hotel de Rambouillet as his biographers believe, for the literary meetings there were lagging considerably since 1658 and ceased entirely in 1665.

The *Dialogues satyriques et moraux* have always been ascribed to Louis Petit of Rouen. Goujet says: "Il est certain que c'est au même (Louis Petit) qu' il faut attribuer des Dialogues satyriques et moraux, en prose, qui parurent aussi en 1686." In confirmation of this statement I note that the title-page of each edition gives the author's name as "Monsieur Petit." Now, the work cannot be a production of Claude Le Petit, who wrote the satire *Paris ridicule,* for he was burned in 1665, and the author of the *Dialogues satyriques et moraux,* according to his *Au Lecteur,* was still living in 1686. The Parisian doctor Pierre Petit (1616-1687) cannot be considered to be its author for he wrote exclusively Latin verse, and, moreover, he lived at Paris, whereas the author of the *Dialogues satyriques* states that he spent at least twenty-five years in the Province.

In 1686 Louis Petit was about seventy-two years old, which is in accordance with the statement in the *Au Lecteur:* "Il y a long-temps que je ne suis plus jeune." Finally, the *Dialogues satyriques et moraux* are entirely in the vein of Louis Petit as illustrated by his preceding volume of satires: *Discours satyriques et moraux ou Satyres générales.*

In view of these facts one seems justified in believing that Louis Petit did not follow P. Corneille to Paris in 1662. His frequent visits to the Hôtel de Rambouillet probably date back from before 1658, for in the manuscript of that date, described by Alph. Chassant and referred to above, many poems are found dedicated to various wits and ladies he may have met there, as La présidente de Franquetot, Mme de Rambouillet, Mme de Motteville, Mme de Gromeny, the marquis de Saint Aignan, and others.

Gustave L. van Roosbroeck.

University of Minnesota.

Note on *Por ce que, Parce que,* and *Pour que*

In the earliest French monuments we find *por ce que* used to express both cause and purpose:

Rut ad le temple *pur ço que* il cornat.
(*La Chanson de Roland*, 2102.)

Pource que la paroy qui estoit entre elle et moy n'estoit pas trop forte, je la pertuisay de mon espee.
(*Les Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, edited by Robida, II, p. 36.)

Sument mil graisle *pur ço que* plus bel seit.
(*La Chanson de Roland*, 1004.)

De trois tisons est faite ceste sente *por ceu ke* li piet de ceos ki a lei se vorront apoier ne puist glacier en la voie.
(Bartsch-Wiese, *Chrestomathie de l'ancien français*, 38, 43.)

The use of *por ce que* in the sense of both *parce que* and *afin que* as indicated above is due to the close relation between the idea of cause and that of purpose.[1] If one does something for a reason, looking forward to producing a future result, he merely expresses the motive from which he does it. If he does something with a purpose, he is also expressing a motive. Both cause and purpose may therefore be regarded as different phases of the same thing, namely, the consideration which impells one to some action looking to the future. The following example shows how easy it is to pass from one of these ideas to the other:

L'enfes Floires est repairiés:
Au terme vient joians et liés.
Un blïaut ot vestu vermeil:
Car de l'huissier en ot conseil,
*Por çou qu'*il avoit une coulor
Et li vestimens et la flor.
(*Floire et Blanceflor*, ed. by Du Meril, 2035-40.)

In the quotation just given *por çou que* is used in the sense of *parce que.* However, if *por çou qu'il avoit une coulor* were changed to a purpose clause, the meaning of the passage would not be materially changed. Whether we say the gate-keeper advised Floire to put on a red tunic *for the reason that* the tunic and the flowers were the same color or *in order that* they might be the same color, the difference in the meaning is not very great. This close relation between cause and purpose can be illustrated from English. The following examples are quoted from Murray's *New English Dictionary,* s. v. *because,* B.†2:

[1] Compare Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des langues romanes*, III, p. 149 (§ 456): "Le motif, la cause, et le but se touchent de si près qu'ils peuvent à bon droit être unis dans une même étude."

"1485 Caxton *Paris and V.* Told to hys fader . . . by cause he shold . . . doo that which he wold require hym. 1526 Tindale Matt. xii. 10 They axed him. because (other versions 'that') they might acuse hym. 1621 Burton *Anat. Mel.* III. ii. IV. i (1651) 525 Anointing the doors and hinges with oyl because they should not creak."

In this connection it is interesting to note that Italian *perchè* also expresses cause and purpose:

> Ma perchè poi ti basti pur la vista,
> Intendi come e perchè son costretti.
> D'ogni malizia ch'odio in cielo acjuista
> Ingiuria è il fine, et ogni fin cotale
> O con forza o con frode altrui contrista.
> Ma perchè frode è dell' uom proprio male,
> Più spiace a Dio.
>
> (Dante, *Inferno*, XI, 20-26.)

Both of the early meanings of *por ce que* indicated above have been preserved in modern French. The modern representative of *por ce que* used to express purpose is *pour que.* The change of *por ce que* to *pour que* is not surprising when we consider that *ce* was also omitted in other conjunctions. With reference to the various conjunctions composed of a preposition followed by *ce que,* Meyer-Lübke says:[2] "En franç. *à ce que, de ce que, par ce que, jusqu'à ce que, en ce que,* autrefois aussi *avant ce que, devant ce que, des ce que, selon ce que,*[3] *sans ce que*[4] encore tout à fait commun au XVe siècle, *pour ce que* encore chez Rabelais." *Pour que* was regarded as good usage in the time of Vaugelas, who says:[5] "Ce terme est fort vsité, particulierement le long la riuiere de Loire, et mesme à la Cour, ou vne personne de tres-eminente condition a bien aydé à le mettre en vogue.[6] On s'en sert en plusieurs façons, qui ne valent rien." The opinion of Vaugelas is also shared by Thomas Corneille and the French Academy.

The Modern French representative of *por ce que* meaning 'because' is *parce que.* With reference to the date of the dis-

[2] See *op. cit.*, p. 638 (III, § 566).

[3] Nonques ne te fu annemie,
Einsois t'a esté bonne amie,
*Selonc ce qu'*elle scet amer.
(*Œuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. by Hoepffner, II, p. 92, ll. 2515-17.)

[4] A Dieu; je me departiray,
Sans ce que de toy me departe.
(*Guillaume de Machaut, op. cit.*, p. 116, ll. 3172-4).

[5] See *Remarques sur la Langue Françoise,* Nouvelle Edition, par A. Chassang, I, pp. 72-74.

[6] M. le Cardinal de Richelieu dans ses Ecrits, et dans ses Lettres. (Note by Patru.)

appearance of *por ce que* and the introduction of *parce que,* Meyer-Lübke says:[7] "En a.—franç. *pour ce ke: pur co qu'il est d'estrange terre, aveit pöur, s'il li mustrast, qu'el l'enhaist* (M. France, *Guig.* 478,) locution qui cependant, au XVIII^e siècle céde absolument le pas à *parce que,* qui se présente à partir du XVI^e; en même temps, on trouve aussi dans l'ancienne langue et encore au XV^e siècle *pour tant que, pour autant que.*" *Parce que* was substituted for *por ce que* because *par* was the preposition used regularly to express cause and motive.[8]

Oliver M. Johnston.

Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The Background of Browning's *Love Among the Ruins*

> In one year they sent a million fighters forth
> South and North,
> And they built their gods a brazen pillar high
> As the sky,
> Yet reserved a thousand chariots in full force—
> Gold, of course.
>
> *Love Among the Ruins,* 73-78.

Browning's use of the word "reserved" in the passage quoted is unexpected, to say the least. May it be explained by a Biblical passage in the King James Version, *I Chronicles,* xviii. 4, which recounts details of David's victory over Hadarezer, King of Zobah?

> "And David took from him a thousand chariots, and seven thousand horsemen, and twenty thousand footmen: David also houghed all the chariot horses, but reserved of them a hundred chariots."

But the context may explain more. We have quoted the fourth verse of the eighteenth chapter. The second verse of the same chapter tells how David smote Moab, which is almost directly south of Israel, while the fifth verse relates his slaughter of the Syrians of Damascus, north of Israel. That he had "a million fighters" to send south and north is implied in Chapter xxi, where Joab's census finds that "all they of Israel were a thousand thousand and a hundred thousand men that drew sword."

The brazen pillar and possibly the chariots of gold may have been suggested by verses 7 and 8 of Chapter xviii:

> "And David took the shields of gold that were on the servants of Hadarezer, and brought them to Jerusalem. Likewise from Tibhath, and

---

[7] See *op. cit.*, p. 665 (§ 588).
[8] See Meyer-Lübke, *op. cit.*, p. 519 (§ 458).

from Chun, cities of Hadarezer, brought David very much brass, wherewith Solomon made the brazen sea, and the pillars and the vessels of brass."

These two pillars, erected in honor of the one God of Israel, were not as "high as the sky," but, according to *II Chronicles,* iii. 15, were thirty-five cubits in height, with capitals of five cubits more.

The usual statement as to the background of this poem is that Browning here contrasts the present desolation of the Roman Campagna with its ancient magnificence. But "all the mountains topped with temples," and the hundred-gated marble wall on which twelve might easily walk abreast are details which suggest a composite picture of Babylon and Jerusalem, fused by the poet's imagination.

Love Among the Ruins was first printed in the *Dramatic Romances* of 1855, along with the revised version of *Saul.* The two poems bear on the same general theme. *Love Among the Ruins* teaches that vital human love is better than all the dead glory of the past; and *Saul,* that finite human love implies infinite divine love. Browning must have composed the two almost simultaneously. *Saul* is the poet's reflection on David the obscure shepherd boy. Is *Love Among the Ruins* a sad reflection on David the victorious but unhappy King?

ROBERT ADGER LAW.

University of Texas.

THE RIMES OF STEFAN GEORGE

In his article on George[1] Mr. E. H. Zeydel uses the phrase "his more recent work" in reference to *Der siebente Ring.* My statement: "His most recent volume consists largely of poems in unrimed lines of five feet, mostly iambic pentameters,"[2] has reference to *Der Stern des Bundes,*[3] published after the volume examined by Mr. Zeydel.

I did not mean to suggest that George has "abandoned" the rimed couplet. Yet the fact remains that there are only eleven rimed poems in the hundred included in *Der Stern des Bundes,* the remainder being in blank verse and unrimed iambic tetrameter, with occasional trochees and anapæsts. The rimed poems appear at regular intervals. The *Eingang* consists of eight unrimed poems and a ninth in rimed couplets. Thereafter every tenth poem is in rime; one in couplets, two with a more elaborate rime scheme and the remainder in quatrains. At the end there is a *Schlusschor* in

[1] *M. L. N.*, February, 1922.
[2] *M. L. N.*, January, 1919, p. 3.
[3] Berlin, 1913; 4th ed., 1920.

unrimed trochaic tetrameter, rounded off by a quatrain (*abab*). It might be interesting to examine the relation of rime to subject matter in this work.

Since *Der Stern des Bundes* George has published, as far as I know, only the volume *Der Krieg* (Berlin, 1917), which I have not yet seen.

Harvard University. TAYLOR STARCK.

A LETTER TO RICHARDSON FROM EDWARD YOUNG

A curious inaccuracy in Mrs. Barbauld's editing of the *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson* (London, 1804) is made evident by what is apparently the original of a letter from Edward Young to Richardson, preserved in the library of Wellesley College. Dated "Ap. 9. 1751," the first half of the letter is nearly identical with the first half of a letter Mrs. Barbauld reprints under date of April 30, 1758. The latter portions of the two letters are quite dissimilar.

The autograph letter in the Wellesley College collection reads as follows:

Dear Sr

I gratefully accept ye Kind Offer you made me of being under yr. Roof for some days while I transact an Affair in Town. I shall be with you on Moonday next, God willing. That God willing, who this moment sets a thousand Agents at work for my Sake, of wh. I know nothing, thogh they are all within me; & shd any one of ym cease to work, it wd prove my instant Death. I mean ye Animal Functions. You know how merry shd I make ye World, shd they hear me say,—"If it please God, I will rise from my Seat,—or, "I will open my Mouth" or, "if it please God I will set Pen to paper. &c: So Ignorant are our Wise ones both of God & Man. And now, Sr[1] wh is ye most respectable Being, a Monarch on his Throne, or a Beggar's Brat at ye Breast, whose Ignorance is not its Crime?

You see I treat you very familiarly, by permitting every thought yt rises in my mind to run thro my Pen to ye Interruption of those Thoughts of yrs, for wh I hope ye World will soon be ye Better. Mrs Hallows salutes you and yrs. I am Dear Sr

Yr much Obligd
Humble Srvt

Ap. 9. 1751. E Young

The letter Mrs. Barbauld reprints (*Correspondence,* II, 48-9) is headed "April 30, 1758." Except for two slight verbal changes easily attributable to the carelessness of the copyist, this letter is identical with the Wellesley autograph letter to the end of the

[1] There is a line drawn through the words, "And now Sr."

[2] The variations are as follows: In the printed letter the third sentence reads "*has* a thousand Agents at work"; though in the autograph the word is not clear, I believe Young wrote *sets* instead of *has*. In the sentence, "So Ignorant are our Wise ones both of God and Man," Mrs. Berbauld omits *both*.

clause, "So Ignorant are our wise ones of God and Man."[2] From this point the printed letter concludes as follows:

With the utmost freedom of a true friend to truth, and to me, favour me with the full opinion of the *dedication* to my sermon; for I am, my dear Sir, somewhat uneasy till I can determine myself about it, and my own judgment is at a loss.

Is there any thing *mean* in what I say of *myself, and my long service at Court?*

Is there *impropriety,* or too *great length,* in what follows about the army?

Pray let me know your real sentiments. Or shall I take your silence as a tender way of your letting me know that you disapprove?

Your truly affectionate

E. Young.

This latter portion of the letter is obviously related in content to a reply from Richardson to Young following this in Mrs. Barbauld's collection (*Correspondence,* II, 50-51), dated "London, May 2, 1758." Young had evidently sent Richardson the proof of a sermon. In his letter Richardson returns the proof, and comments especially, as requested, upon the matter of the dedication. He makes no mention of a visit from Young since April 30, and apparently has no immediate expectation of one, since he answers Young's questions quite fully, and sends the "best wishes and respects" of his family. The second half of the printed letter from Young appears, then, to be properly dated 1758; whereas the first half is chronologically out of place. The beginning would appear, therefore, to be that of an earlier letter substituted deliberately or inadvertently by Mrs. Barbauld or her copyist. This earlier letter was presumably that of 1751 now in the Wellesley College Library.

The lost beginning of the later letter, we may surmise, contained Young's explanation of his intention to resume, after some years of neglect, his duties as chaplain for a month at Court. He also, presumably, commented upon his determination to print a special sermon for the occasion with a dedication to the king hinting once more at his hopes of preferment already too long delayed. It is regrettable that Young's statements to Richardson concerning these matters can be only a matter of surmise based on the latter half of his letter and on Richardson's reply.[3]

Faith in the authenticity of the Wellesley autograph letter, and in the correctness of its date, is supported by the following analysis of Young's handwriting made by the Keeper of the Manuscripts of the British Museum in response to inquiries from the Librarian of Wellesley College:

"The letter has every appearance of being in the autograph of Edw. Young. The form of *e* is particularly characteristic, the old English ȣ

[3] In regard to this period of Young's career, with comment on the circumstances surrounding this letter see, Shelley, H. G., *The Life and Letters of Edward Young* (Boston, 1914), pp. 246-47.

degenerating into a dot on the line with a disconnected curve lying on its back above. This *e* is found more carefully written in Young's letter to Mrs. Howard in Add. MS. 22626, f. 117 (*cir.* 1734), and in a very similar degenerate form in the letter to the Duke of Newcastle in Add. 32881, f. 293 (1758) and those to George Keate in Add. 30992, ff. 1, 2, (1760). Another point is the spelling of Monday as "Moonday" which occurs also in the letter to Mrs. Howard. If the letter is accepted as autograph, the date "Ap. 9. 1751," being clearly in the hand of the body of the letter, must be the correct one and the passage at the end beginning: "wh is ye most respectable being" must be the original conclusion. The character of the hand strongly favours the earlier date, for in 1758 Young was already ill and his hand had begun to shake, as appears from the letter to Newcastle. In 1760 his eyes were failing and the hand had still further degenerated. After 1761, on the evidence of the George Keate volume, his housekeeper, Mrs. Hallows, served as amanuensis. . . . It is to be noted that Young had the habit of dating his letters in the bottom left-hand corner."

The Forster Collection of Richardson's correspondence in the Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington, does not contain any letters from Edward Young, the librarian states. Search of this correspondence for the years 1751-58 by a member of the library staff revealed no reference to the letter in the Wellesley collection.

This one instance of the telescoping of two letters in date seven years apart suggests a more general inaccuracy in Mrs. Barbauld's editing, and makes more than ever desirable a fresh study of the Richardson correspondence in the Forster Collection.

HELEN SARD HUGHES.

Wellesley College.

BRIEF MENTION

Milton's Prosody, with a chapter on Accentual Verse and Notes, by Robert Bridges. Revised final edition (Oxford University Press, 1921. viii + 119 pp.). In a playful preface Mr. Bridges expresses the wish that the book could itself utter a vituperative prelude against its creator, for that would be welcome because of his "sense of justice and sport" and because it would "supply that first utility of a preface, which is to spare critics the labour of examining the book." This fancy would be disturbed by being linked with the serious history of the book. That recital is therefore banished to a place "among the notes at the end." The "Note A to the preface" (pp. 113-114), concerning matters now declared "not fit for a preface" will therefore be accepted as representing a pardonable inconsistency with the writer's judgment of the appropriate purport of a preface shown in the edition of 1901.

As much of the history of the book as is now set down has points of special interest. That the author began to write on

Milton's versification thirty-three years ago, and that he has now welcomed the invitation of his publishers to "finally rehandle" the subject, because he has come "to learn more about the subject than I understood when I began with it,"—these are statements that put a stress both upon the virtue of a sustained purpose and upon the subject of versification as one that requires diligent study rather than hasty and subjective guess-work. Mr. Bridges frankly acknowledges that in its previous forms his treatise has been to him "a perennial discomfort." At one time it induced "some young poets" to adopt "Miltonic inversions so freely into their blank verse that champions of the prevailing orthodoxy raised an indignant protest in the newspapers, wherein the discussion grew so incredibly hot that a London evening journal advertised 'prosody' as an attractive item in its daily posters."

Altho the book now before us has been newly composed, it will not be found that Mr. Bridges has altogether changed his method of scansion. He still holds, for example, that there are "lines with only four accents" (p. 38):

> *As from* the Center thrice to th' utmost Pole. i, 74.
> *And in* luxurious Cities where the noyse. i, 498.

The italics mark "the unaccented or weak 'feet.'" This fundamental error is mitigated by the assumption that in reading "a slight accent will be given" to the initial words of the quoted lines, "so that the foot is really inverted." But this does not create a presumption, as it might, against the further teaching that the stress may fail in the second, third, fourth, and even in the fifth place. It fails in the second place in "Serv'd on*ly to* discover sights of woe"; in the fifth place, in "No light, but rather darkness vis*ible,*" where again, it is assumed, that the inherent rhythmic value of the last syllable of a line may enable a weak syllable to "hold its own in this tenth place, and the last essential accent of the verse may be that of the 'fourth foot.'" This reasoning is carried still further to justify the statement that "some lines have only three full stresses." One of the given examples is this, "Transfix *us to* the bott*om of* this Gulfe"; and the conclusion is reached "that there is no one place in the verse where an accent is indispensable." Conversely, no line can have more than five stresses, for in the unusual line, "Rocks, cáves, lakes, féns, bogs, déns, and shádes of déath," "the accented syllables will, by the enforcing of voice-tone, be able to subordinate" rhythmically the heavy words in the theses. This is correct, but it should suggest that the rhythm will also evoke the stress on syllables that in prose are usually light, for rhythm plays the pipe to which the word-accents, whether they be heavy or light, must dance.

It is to be regretted that in assuming "variety in number of stresses," Mr. Bridges has again indorsed errors that pervert

fundamental principles of English versification. A poet need not be reminded that rhythmic regularity in the succession of stresses does not require the stresses to be of equal 'weight'; that the line-melody is diversified by the variations in the weight of the regularly disposed stresses. And surely in the practice of versification no one can escape the conviction that there is a verse-rhetoric that induces minutely effective accuracy in the employment of minor words and of formative syllables that express conceptual relations and modifications of the thought. There is therefore a permissible stressing of prepositions and conjunctions as well as of formative syllables, such as *-ble, -er, -est, -ly, -ness, -y,* etc. and *dis-, mis-, pro-, pre-, trans-, un-,* etc.,—a stressing that is governed by the principle of appropriate and effective expression of subordinate concepts and relations. Mr. Bridges is in serious error, therefore, when he declares that it would make many of Milton's lines ridiculous to stress the conjunction *and,* which the poet has often placed in "stress-places" (p. 39). He may also permit one to ask him to suppress preconceptions that he may test his response to the following scansion of lines he has cited:

> And ín luxúrious cíties whére the nóyse.
> Serv'd ónly tó discóver sights of wóe.
> No líght, but ráther dárkness vísiblé.
> His Mínistérs of véngeance ánd pursúit.
> Transfíx us tó the bóttom óf this gúlfe.

Mr. Bridges may say that this it is just that "prevailing orthodoxy" which he is laboring to correct. But will the rejoinder not be affected by an untrammelled consideration of the conceptual principles reflected in that orthodoxy,—principles that are so easily verified in the exigencies of special emphasis in prose? These special effects in prose clearly indicate the sustained exigencies under which the language is employed in versification; the finer and varied shades of emphasis thus come to mark off the art of poetry from the art of prose.

Mr. Bridges has, therefore, announced and defended a doctrine of rhythm that, in the judgment of the writer of this notice, is so fundamentally untenable as to affect the validity of his treatise. He has prepared his readers for statements that would otherwise cause bewilderment. Thus, for example: "A consistent prosody is, however, so insignificant a part in what makes good English poetry, that I find that I do not myself care very much whether some good poetry be consistent in its versification or not: indeed I think I have liked some verses better because they do not scan, and thus displease pedants" (p. 99). But that view, he adds, must of course not interfere with one when "considering [pedantically] prosody and the principles of rhythm." In this connection one is reminded of Mr. Verity's amazing words: "No one,

of course, should presume to tie Milton down to rigid principles of prosody, and scan his lines as though they were a schoolboy's copy of much-toiled iambics. A poet like Milton makes his own laws, and it is our business to find out what those laws are, ere we criticise" (*Samson Agonistes,* 1892, xxxvii f.).

Another, indeed the principal, argument against unwavering 'regularity' of rhythm is developed by 'inverting the feet.' Here one encounters one of those persistent errors which have the peculiar force of holding and attracting adherents disposed to favor an attitude of mind in vaunted superiority to the guidance of sound and simple instruction. Mr. Bridges continues to teach 'inversion,' but because of the lack of stress-marks thruout portions of his treatise the limits of his doctrine are not clear. One is left to make inferences from his selected examples.

As to the inversion of the first foot, Mr. Bridges correctly accepts its historic validity (p. 42), and also rightly observes that this inversion does not "disturb the rhythm." Inversions within the line are acknowledged to disturb the rhythm, but this is in conformity with the assumption that "the accent may be shifted on to the odd syllable in any place in the line." This serves "to call attention to the word which carries the irregular accent or stress." These inversions "are, therefore, used primarily in relation to the sense." The rhetoric of prose is thus allowed to displace the more subtle rhetoric of verse. This sustains the artistically harmful school-dictum, once so insistently taught, that poetry should be read as one would read prose. Mr. Bridges is not, it will be agreed, misrepresented in that inference, for he declares that all inversions and variations of rhythm "owe their value to the presupposed metrical type from which they vary; but they must not be disguised by reading a conventional stress in the regular place. They determine the rhythm [this is not clear], nor is the metre falsified by them, because the interruption is not long enough, and the majority of verses sustain the impression of the typical form" (p. 42). But no unbiassed reader can fail to observe that the "impression of the typical form" is 'sustained' in the "majority of verses" by stresses belonging to those accentual (or grammatical) and conceptual categories which Mr. Bridges pronounces inadmissible. This would be observed if all the stresses were marked in the lines selected to show inversion. Thus, in "Me, me only, just object of His ire," the stress on *ónely* is marked to show inversion of the second foot; but what of the remaining stresses, especially that of the preposition *of*? And surely the line cited from Keats is to be scanned thus:

Bright stâr, would Ĭ were stéadfast âs thou ârt

But here Mr. Bridges finds an inverted fifth foot. The true scansion of this line legitimates those categories of stress which thru

the centuries have been employed by the poets, and which establish, therefore, those permanent principles and conventionalities of English rhythm (of iambic and trochaic movement) which, regrettably, Mr. Bridges has now in his *novissima verba* not dealt with in a satisfactory manner.

J. W. B.

Fleurs de France, Poésies lyriques depuis le Romantisme. Avec introduction de W. P. Ker, professeur de poésie à Oxford, et préface de Lady Frazer (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1921. xvi + 160 pp.). Cette petite anthologie dont l'auteur n'est pas nommé rendra de réels services au public et aux élèves de langue anglaise. Selon la formule connue, elle peut être mise entre toutes les mains. La division bien qu'arbitraire est en somme acceptable: les derniers Romantiques, les Parnassiens, les Symbolistes, les modernes. Dans le détail cependant, on éprouve quelque étonnement à voir classer Ephraïm Mikhaël, Hélène Vacaresco et Rostand parmi les Parnassiens; en plus d'un cas la distinction entre les Symbolistes et les modernes pourrait également se discuter. Le choix témoigne d'un goût très sûr et d'une connaissance exacte du mouvement poétique des cinquante dernières années. On doit remercier le compilateur anonyme d'avoir attiré l'attention sur plusieurs poètes trop peu connus du public étranger. Mais pourquoi, puisque parmi les femmes on citait Hélène Vacaresco et la comtesse de Noailles, n'avoir pas donné au moins un poème d'Hélène Picard? G. C.

Index Verborum de Covarruvias Orozco: Tesoro de la Lengua Castellana o Española, Madrid, 1674-1673. By John M. Hill. (*Indiana University Studies,* Vol. VIII, Study No. 48, March, 1921. Pp. iv, 186.) Professor John M. Hill has done a real service to Hispanic studies by preparing an alphabetical list of all the words that are explained in the dictionary of Covarruvias, with definite directions as to where each word can be found. Those having to do with the literature of the Spanish *Siglo de Oro* know that the dictionary of Covarruvias is invaluable, but they have learned from bitter experience that it is often difficult to find the desired word. It may be there, but be quite out of its proper place. With the aid of Professor Hill's index one may ascertain at a glance whether the word is to be found in the dictionary, and if it is there, one knows how to turn to it quickly.

There are two editions of the dictionary of Covarruvias, that of 1611, and that of 1674 with additional material added by Remigio. Professor Hill chose the second edition as the more complete; moreover, that roughly coincides in date with the close of the Golden Age of Spanish literature. E. C. H.

321

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVII JUNE, 1922 NUMBER 6

RATIONAL AND EMOTIONAL ELEMENTS IN HEINRICH VON KLEIST

It is by no means uncommon that a German poet should have, early in life, a philosophical experience of profound and decisive effect. In his twenty-fourth year Heinrich von Kleist was convinced by the study of the Kantian philosophy that final knowledge is impossible of attainment, that we can hope to know at most only the appearance of things; and thereupon he cast to the winds the rationalistic philosophy which he had so confidently elaborated. Deprived of Reason as the guide of life, he was without a guide; incomprehensible life was to him tragic; and the tragedy of it he proceeded to illustrate in dramatic form.

This philosophical catastrophe was not merely an effect; it was also a symptom. Evidently it need not have affected so profoundly or so tragically a poet who was not to a dangerous extent a reasoner, a ponderer on that essence of life which lies back of its phenomena.

Otto Ludwig and Friedrich Hebbel were also, though from different points of view, excessive reasoners. Ludwig's poetic imagination suffered from the interference of his critical reason, and Hebbel was acquainted with that excessive clearness of vision which impedes, instead of aiding, the poetic process:

> Dies steht so klar vor meinem Geist,
> Dass, wenn ich's minder hell erblickte,
> Das Werk vielleicht mir besser glückte.
> (*Der Diamant, Prolog*)

It was only natural, then, that Hebbel should have discerned and criticized in Kleist a fault he knew to be in himself; he observes

in his *Diary:* "In Heinrich von Kleists falscher Plastik wird gewissermassen der Lebensodem auch sichtbar gemacht."[1]

Perhaps this antagonism of reason and imagination, and the consciousness of it, are impediments of modern poets in general. At any rate, they are especially characteristic of Kleist. To a poet of less rationalistic temper, the recognition of the relativity of all knowledge and the limitation of human cognition to phenomena, might have proved not only innocuous, but positively invigorating. Such a poet might have derived enhanced self-confidence from the thought that Nature is for us what we see and hear and feel; that this most beautiful world *is* not, in the Fichtean phraseology, until the poet perceives it through his finer senses. Such a view of poetry is epitomized in Goethe's *Türmerlied:*

Zum Sehen geboren,
Zum Schauen bestellt,
Dem Turme geschworen,
Gefällt mir die Welt.
. . . . . .
Ihr glücklichen Augen,
Was je ihr gesehn,
Es sei, wie es wolle,
Es war doch so schön!

But this attitude was not possible for a man who all his life saw too clearly and felt himself impelled to portray too truthfully what he saw with an eye not merely sensuous. Kleist was by nature rigorously honest. He found it always difficult and often impossible to separate himself from his work, and rise superior to it. His dramas are such agonizing births because they treat not simply an objective and a formal, but also a subjective and a personal problem. And in the most personal of them the white heat of passion burns away the poetic form: *Guiskard* remained a torso, *Penthesilea* a madness. Kleist's works are autobiographical in a more poignant sense than Goethe's. Rare indeed were the moments when Kleist could write of himself, as he did from Switzerland in 1802: "Ich . . . kann zuweilen wie ein Dritter über mich urteilen."[2]

[1] *Werke,* ed. Werner, IV, 5740.
[2] *Werke,* ed. Erich Schmidt, V, 282, 18-19.

The man and the poet are in Kleist inseparable. That is why he so promptly assumed an attitude of personal hostility toward Goethe and Iffland. He so identified life and poetry that disparagement of his work was, in his eyes, tantamount to contempt for his personality. In the fictitious *Brief eines jungen Dichters an einen jungen Maler,* Kleist voices his opinion as to the element of personality in art: "Die Aufgabe, Himmel und Erde! ist ja nicht, ein anderer, sondern ihr selbst zu sein, und euch selbst, euer Eigenstes und Innerstes, durch Umriss und Farben, zur Anschauung zu bringen." [3]

In the version of *Käthchen* printed in the *Phöbus* in 1808, Kunigunde is made to say, of a lesser art, to be sure, but still characteristically:

> Die Kunst . . .
> Ist mehr, als blos ein sinnenreizendes
> Verbinden von Gestalten und von Farben.
> Das unsichtbare Ding, das Seele heisst,
> Möcht' ich an Allem gern erscheinen machen.[4]

And in the last year of his life, Kleist wrote to Fouqué: "Die Erscheinung, die am meisten bei der Betrachtung eines Kunstwerks rührt, ist, dünkt mich, nicht das Werk selbst, sondern die Eigentümlichkeit des Geistes, der es hervorbrachte, und der sich, in unbewusster Freiheit und Lieblichkeit, darin entfaltet." [5] Here is one of those passages which give rise to facile and specious comparisons of Kleist with the Romanticists. Yet his ultimate motive, here as elsewhere, is essentially un-Romantic: a passionate desire for the ascertainment of recondite truth. And no devotee of the Romantic Irony, certainly, would have contented himself with merely "unconscious" freedom to dominate his work.

Kleist himself recognized the distance between the domains of reason and of imagination when he wrote: "Ich kann eine Differentiale finden, und einen Vers machen; sind das nicht die beiden Enden der menschlichen Fähigkeit?" [6] In one of his last letters, he deplores his inability to visualize adequately an absent friend; his reason tells him that the friend exists, and this importunate sense of reality fetters his imagination: "Wirklich, in

[3] *Ibid.*, IV, 146, 27-30.
[4] *Ibid.*, IV, 365.
[5] *Ibid.*, V, 418, 14-18.
[6] *Ibid.*, V, 316, 23-25.

einem so besonderen Falle ist noch vielleicht kein Dichter gewesen. . . . Es ist, als ob diese, in allen Bedingungen angeordnete Bestimmtheit, meiner Phantasie, im Augenblick der Tätigkeit selbst, Fesseln anlegte." [7]

The same rationalistic quality in his nature which had made him a too easy victim to philosophy, the same unhappy sense for a truth not merely poetic, but real, thus played havoc with the impulsive ventures of his imagination. It rendered him unable to stop at superficial beauties; it bade him probe with relentless reason into the very heart of the mystery of things. In a letter to his sister, he laments over the "unhappy clarity" of vision which nature has inflicted upon him:

> Vielleicht hat die Natur Dir jene Klarheit zu Deinem Glücke versagt, jene traurige Klarheit, die mir zu jeder Miene den Gedanken, zu jedem Worte den Sinn, zu jeder Handlung den Grund nennt. Sie zeigt mir alles, was mich umgiebt, und mich selbst, in seiner ganzen armseligen Blösse, und der farbige Nebel verschwindet, und alle die gefällig geworfenen Schleier sinken und dem Herzen ekelt zuletzt vor dieser Nacktheit. O glücklich bist Du, wenn Du das nicht verstehst.[8]

Fully aware of the fatal dualism in his own nature, Kleist looked with wistful longing upon those naive artists who portray external beauty, troubled by no doubt as to the truth behind it: "O wie oft habe ich diese glücklichen Menschen beneidet, welche kein Zweifel um das Wahre, das sich nirgends findet, bekümmert, die nur in dem Schönen leben." [9] It was Kleist's tragedy as a poet that he was not, and knew that he was not, such a naive artist, that he could not, like Keats, believe in the identity of Truth and Beauty, but was cursed with the desire to seek beyond Beauty for an absolute Truth.

Realizing the obstructive effect of this rationalistic element in his character, he tried to counteract it. He emphasizes repeatedly the importance of immediacy of feeling in poetry. To his friend Rühle he writes: "Ich höre, Du, mein lieber Junge, beschäftigst Dich auch mit der Kunst? Es giebt nichts Göttlicheres, als sie! Und nichts Leichteres zugleich; und doch, warum ist es so schwer? Jede erste Bewegung, alles Unwillkürliche, ist schön; und schief und verschroben Alles, sobald es sich selbst begreift. O der Ver-

[7] *Ibid.*, v, 427, 27-34.
[8] *Ibid.*, v, 189, 24-32.
[9] *Ibid.*, v, 222, 17-20.

stand! Der unglückselige Verstand! Studiere nicht zu viel, mein lieber Junge . . . Folge Deinem Gefühl."[10] And to the same purport he writes to the painter Lohse: "Nichts, nichts gedacht, frage Dein erstes Gefühl, dem folge."[11]

Shortly before his death Kleist looked forward to a period of high literary productivity, in which his works should reflect his inner self directly, without the intervention of critical reason:

> Alsdann will ich meinem Herzen ganz und gar, wo es mich hinführt, folgen, und schlechterdings auf nichts Rücksicht nehmen, als auf meine eigene innerliche Befriedigung. . . . Kurz, ich will mich von dem Gedanken ganz durchdringen, dass, wenn ein Werk nur recht frei aus dem Schooss des menschlichen Gemüts hervorgeht, dasselbe auch notwendig darum der ganzen Menschheit angehören müsse.[12]

The same striving for an immediacy of expression which shall eliminate the intrusive rational processes is evident in Kleist's utterances concerning the language of poetry. He makes one poet say to another: "Wenn ich beim Dichten in meinen Busen fassen, meinen Gedanken ergreifen, und mit Händen, ohne weitere Zutat, in den Deinigen legen könnte, so wäre, die Wahrheit zu gestehen, die ganze innere Forderung meiner Seele erfüllt."[13] He deplores the inadequacy of language to convey ideas and feelings: "Selbst das einzige [Mittel zur Mitteilung], das wir besitzen, die Sprache, taugt nicht dazu; sie kann die Seele nicht malen, und was sie uns giebt, sind nur zerrissene Bruchstücke."[14] Usually, language is a "fetter," a "brake on the wheel of the spirit."[15]

And I believe it was the same search for a non-rational and immediate mode of communication which led Kleist again and again to music. The inclination toward music is one of very few tendencies which connect Kleist with Romanticism. It was the yearning of the Romanticists for unity of consciousness, for the reunion of sense and soul, of nature and the individual, which made them turn to music as to the realm which Wackenroder called "das Land des Glaubens, wo alle unsre Zweifel und unsre Leiden sich in ein tönendes Meer verlieren." But for Kleist, again, it was not only an artistic or a metaphysical, but an acutely personal concern. And Kleist could never have lost himself in that

[10] *Ibid.*, v, 328, 4-11.
[11] *Ibid.*, v, 273, 26-7.
[12] *Ibid.*, v, 430, 9-20.
[13] *Ibid.*, iv, 148, 26-29.
[14] *Ibid.*, v, 195, 2-4.
[15] *Ibid.*, iv, 78, 22-3.

vague and subjective emotionalism which the younger Tieck sought in music.

We are told that, though he had no formal musical schooling, Kleist early showed an aptitude for music, and could repeat readily melodies learned by ear. As a young lieutenant of the guard at Potsdam, he played the clarinet in an orchestra of officers, and he is even credited with a few simple compositions. There is in his early letters a passage which reminds one remotely of Otto Ludwig's confession regarding his process of poetic composition. Kleist speaks of being able to hear, especially in the solitude of evening, concerts complete in every detail of melody and orchestration. These concerts he can repeat to himself at will; but as soon as a *thought* intrudes, the whole celestial symphony vanishes as if at the touch of magic.[16] Again, speaking of the influence of landscape on the development of character, he puts music at the head of the arts which appeal to feeling.[17]

Apparently, then, Kleist regarded music as predominantly an emotional art, and this is corroborated by his allusion to its distinctly feminine nature;[18] the feminine is for Kleist always the irrational and emotional. In the days which followed the terrific disillusionment by Kant, when his attitude toward Catholicism changed significantly from the coldly rationalistic to the intuitively emotional, he is tremendously impressed by the power of church music.[19]

His theoretical interest in music seems to have increased toward the end of his life. A notable document for this is the story *Die heilige Cäcilie oder die Gewalt der Musik*,[20] in which a miraculous power is attributed to the art of Saint Cecilia. And some of the thoughts of Nietzsche's *Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik* are foreshadowed in a remarkable utterance in one of Kleist's last letters: the poet speaks of his intention to forsake poetry entirely for a year or more, and devote himself almost exclusively to music, which he appears to regard as a transcendental, parent art of arts:

> Denn ich betrachte diese Kunst als die Wurzel, oder vielmehr, um mich schulgerecht auszudrücken, als die algebraische Formel aller übrigen, und

---

[16] *Ibid.*, v, 133, 26-134, 10.
[17] *Ibid.*, 100, 21-24.
[18] *Ibid.*, III, 378, 25-6.
[19] *Ibid.*, v, 222, 25 ff.
[20] *Ibid.*, III, 377-390.

so wie wir schon einen Dichter haben [Goethe]—mit dem ich mich übrigens auf keine Weise zu vergleichen wage—der alle seine Gedanken über die Kunst, die er übt, auf Farben bezogen hat, so habe ich, von meiner frühesten Jugend an, alles Allgemeine, was ich über die Dichtkunst gedacht habe, auf Töne bezogen. Ich glaube, dass im Generalbass die wichtigsten Aufschlüsse über die Dichtkunst enthalten sind.[21]

To be sure, the last sentence, with its allusion to the "grammar" of music, presents a rationalistic idea. But that should not surprise us in a poet in whom reason and feeling appear at times to interpenetrate; Kleist's reason seems impelled by the passionate vindictiveness of feeling, and his feeling by the remorseless logic of thought. Two sentences of Otto Ludwig succinctly characterize this strange union: "Bei Kleist zeigt sich uns der Verstand als Leidenschaft," [22] and again: "Die Leidenschaft handelt nicht allein, sie reflektiert auch." [23] It is no mere chance that Kleist should speak, in one of his most characteristic figures, of the "Goldwage der Empfindung." [24] But such a union of the two elements was as spurious and as deceptive as the premature serenity of Kleist's youthful rationalism. Reason and feeling remained antagonistic, and Kleist suffered as a creative artist from this unresolved antinomy in his nature.[25]

Walter Silz.

Harvard University.

---

[21] *Ibid.*, v, 429, 24-33.

[22] *Gesammelte Werke*, Leipzig, 1891, v, 349.

[23] *Ibid.*, 532.

[24] *Werke*, i, 264, 1396; iii, 147, 26.

[25] Some readers of *Modern Language Notes* may not yet know of the existence of the *Kleist-Gesellschaft*, which was founded in Berlin in 1920 and has its seat in Frankfurt a. O. The first general meeting was held in the latter city last winter under the presidency of Professor Minde-Pouet. The society aims to foster the memory of Kleist and the literature concerning him, and to publish "Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft" and a year-book. Its organization is democratic, and its membership in Germany is already large. One may become a member by applying to the Schriftführer. Geschäftsstelle der Kleist-Gesellschaft, Frankfurt a. O., Gubener Strasse 36. The annual dues are at least 20 Marks, and life membership may be acquired by the contribution of at least 1000 Marks.

THE *TRENTE-SIX BALLADES JOYEUSES* OF THEODORE DE BANVILLE

In his dissertation on the life and work of Théodore de Banville,[1] Fuchs notes Banville's admission that he had modeled his *Trente-six ballades joyeuses*[2] after Villon. He then proceeds to call attention to some of the more obvious imitations; but the scope of his work prevents his studying this point in detail. The attempt will be made here to show just how close was Banville's dependence upon Villon, upon the ballads as well as upon the rest of the *Grand testament* and upon the *Petit testament.*

The *Trente-six ballades joyeuses* may be roughly divided, from the point of view of subject matter, into the following groups: 1) those that treat of women and of love (16); 2) those which sing of one or another phase of the joy of living (5); 3) those whose refrain is the love of poetry (3); 4) those which celebrate one or another aspect of nature (5); 5) those whose central theme is the poet himself (4); and 6) those written in a tone of counsel or of irony (3). Of these rubrics, all are present in Villon with the exception of the love of poetry and the love of nature. Villon, the poet of death, as M. Lanson calls him,[3] and only secondarily that of the joys of life, was too spontaneous a poet to be concerned with the art of versification as such, and he was still too much of the Middle Ages to be susceptible to the external graces of nature. Banville might, thus, be called a blasé, though nature-loving, Villon. The thirty-six ballads show both of these elements lacking in the *Grand testament* and the *Petit testament.*

The first of the *Trente-six ballades joyeuses,* the "Ballade de ses regrets pour l'an mil huit cent trente," written in January, 1862, reflects Banville's feeling that French literature, which had attained to such heights in 1830, was now on the wane. Just as Villon laments the disappearance of the "snows of yesteryear," and his "belle heaulmière" gives voice to her regrets for the evanescence

[1] *Théodore de Banville—contributions à l'histoire de la poésie française pendant la seconde moitié du xix siècle,* p. 399.

[2] Paris, Lemerre, 1873. Ten of these thirty-six ballads had previously appeared in the *Parnasse contemporain* for 1869. The edition used in this study is that published by Fasquelle, Paris, 1907.

[3] *Histoire de la littérature française,* 13th edition, p. 176.

of the charms of her youth, mourning that nothing is left her but "honte et peché," so Banville sighs for the day when "Musset chantait, Hugo tenait la lyre," when Nodier, the two Deschamps, and Vigny gave such impetus to the Romantic movement; but his sighs are in vain, for "à présent, c'est bien fini de rire." The mood of the very next ballad, however, the "Ballade des belles Châlonnaises," is much more sprightly, though with a gaiety which Fuchs rightly deems artificial. Villon had found that the women of Paris are paramount in gossip; Banville, making himself the judge of other feminine virtues, awarded the palm for physical perfection to the women of Châlons, a city whose name he probably chose because of its usefulness as the rhyming word in the refrain. In its detailed description of the charms of the "filles de Châlons," this ballad recalls the "Regrets de la belle heaulmière" as well as the "Ballade de la belle heaulmière."

Banville's "Ballade de la bonne doctrine" (No. 3), again, is only a nineteenth-century version of Villon's "Ballade de bonne doctrine à ceux de mauvaise vie," with the Rabelaisian touch which Fuchs justly calls one of the dominant elements of the *Trente-six ballades joyeuses*. But the true Banvillesque note is sounded in the "Envoi," in which the poet expresses himself as being "épris," not "d'amour," but "des vers, des lys, des falbalas, Tranchons le mot, de la littérature." In a word, Banville's epicureanism seems to be chiefly of the imagination, and it is in his cultivation of literature as the supreme pleasure of life, in his love of art for its own sake, that Banville differs from both his great models, Villon and Rabelais. The "Ballade de sa fidélité à la poésie" (no. 6) succinctly expresses this side of Banville's nature; in the refrain the poet asks and answers the question as to his purpose in life: "Pourquoi je vis? Pour l'amour du laurier." This refrain may be contrasted with that of the "Ballade intitulée: Les Contredits de Franc-Gontier" which Villon bequeathed to his friend "maistre Andry Courault." Villon's maxim: "Il n'est trésor que de vivre à son aise" has a much more genuine ring than do those of Banville's ballads in which the joys of life are extolled. Banville was never more than a sort of epicurean dilettante; Villon was a thorough-going epicurean who was subject to spells of remorse and whose baser moments were more than redeemed by his inspired glimpses behind the veil of the eternal which shrouds appearances.

The "Ballade en l'honneur de sa mie" (no. 4) brings out rather forcefully the more or less superficial manner in which Banville has imitated Villon. The "Ballade de Villon à s'amye" is permeated by a strain of sadness, by the rational element that is so marked in all the work of this "first of the moderns." If Villon writes a ballad in honor of his lady-love, it is to complain of "amour dure, plus que fer, à mascher," to foresee the early disappearance of the charms of youth, the day when "vieil je seray, vous, laide et sans couleur," and to call upon every generous-minded person to come to his rescue. Banville, in lighter vein, scorns the wealth of a Rothschild, the pedantry of a Nisard declaring: "Je ne veux du tout que ma mie." Likewise, in his "Ballade pour une amoureuse" (no. 5), Banville, light of heart, sees everything through the most rose-tinted of spectacles. It suffices merely to place this ballad beside the touching tribute paid by Villon in his *Petit testament* to her who "si durement m'a chassé." [4]

The nature-ballads of Banville (nos. 7, 16, 17, 28, and 32) resemble Villon's poems in form only; their content bespeaks rather the influence of the Pléiade. On the other hand, the ultra-romanticism of the ballads in which Banville writes about himself (nos. 18, 26, and 36) is well matched by the fifteenth-century individualism of Villon, by that keen delight in self [5] with which the Renaissance inspired a world so long shackled by the dry, utterly impersonal, scholasticism of the Dark Ages.

As for the remainder of the Banville ballads which are concerned with love and with the women of the poet's entourage, the "Ballade sur la gentille façon de Rose" (no. 8) would seem to be but the Banvillesque version of Villon's stanzas to his own "chère Rose;" [6] the "Ballade pour sa commère" (no. 9), with its display

[4] Stanzas 5-10, *Oeuvres*, ed. Lacroix, Paris, E. Flammarion.

[5] Gaston Paris, in his monograph on Villon, considers this personal note the dominating characteristic of our poet; "C'est par là," says Paris (p. 153), "que son œuvre est surtout originale et qu'il mérite le nom du premier des poètes modernes." Cf. Villon's "Ballade au nom de la fortune," the "Ballade de Villon," the "Débat du cueur et du corps de Villon," the "Quatrain que feit Villon quand il fut jugé à mourir," and stanza 14, among many others of the *Grand testament*, in which Villon so frankly admits his sinfulness: "Je suis pecheur, je le scay bien."

[6] *Grand testament*, stanzas 80-83

of feminine graces, recalls, again, the "belle heaulmière" poems. The bitterness, real or pretended, of Banville's "Ballade pour célébrer les pucelles" (no. 10) brings to mind many of the stanzas of the *Grand testament,* more especially, perhaps, those celebrated ones inspired by the "charnier des Innocens."[7] The "Ballade pour la servante du cabaret" (no. 13), is the counterpart of the "Ballade de Villon et de la grosse Margot." In the "Ballade pour trois soeurs qui sont ses amies" (no. 15), Lucy, Lise, and Marinette appear to be no more than softened images of Marianne l'Ydolle, "la grant Jehanne de Bretaigne," and their ilk;[8] or, too, of the "filles tresbelles et gentes" who are celebrated in stanza 94 of the *Grand testament.* The "Ballade pour les Parisiennes" (no. 21) is, again, Banville's tribute to the "Ballade des femmes de Paris." The "Ballade à sa femme, Lorraine" (no. 24) may be placed alongside the "Ballade que Villon donna à ung gentilhomme nouvellement marié, pour l'envoyer à son espouse, par luy conquise à l'espée." The "Ballade de l'amour bon ouvrier" (no. 27) is the antithesis of many of Villon's expressions on the same subject, set forth, for example, in the "Double ballade sur le mesme propos," and in stanza 25 of the *Grand testament,* beginning: "Il est bien vray que j'ay aymé." The "Ballade à sa mère" (no. 31) recalls Villon's reference to his mother in the *Grand testament.*[9] And after celebrating his mother in a ballad, it was most natural that Banville should address the Virgin, the patroness of the mothers of both great poets. Thus the "Ballade que feit Villon à la requeste de sa mère pour prier Nostre Dame" is paralleled by Banville's "Ballade à la sainte vierge" (no. 35). There remain but three ballads in the group that is concerned with women and love for which no precise parallels are to be found in Villon; the "Ballade pour une aux cheveux dorés" (no. 14), the "Ballade pour une guerrière de marbre" (no. 19),[10] and the "Ballade de la belle Viroise" (no. 25); but these ballads contain only repetitions of notions expressed in many others of the group so that echoes and resemblances suggest themselves in Villon.

[7] Stanzas 147-152.

[8] Cf. *Grand testament,* stanza 141.

[9] Stanza 79.

[10] The subject here, to be sure, is the statue of a woman, but the poem may be said to fall into the present rubric.

In ballads 29 and 30 of Banville's collection, the "Ballade de Victor Hugo père de tous les rimeurs" and the "Ballade de la sainte buverie," no direct comparisons with anything in Villon offer themselves; whereas in the "Ballade en faveur de la poésie dédaignée" (no. 11), the refrain: "Où dors-tu, grande ombre d'Alcée?" reminds one faintly of the refrain in the "Ballade des dames du temps jadis."

Those of Banville's ballads which treat of the joy of living or which are written in a tone of somewhat ironical counsel show the same difference of attitude in the nineteenth century poet and the fifteenth century poet as do those in which Banville treats of the pleasures of love. The "Ballade de Banville aux enfants perdus" (no. 12) is something more than a mere echo of the "Belle leçon de Villon aux enfants perdus;" for whereas Villon is thinking of the material things of life exclusively and advises his friends to spend what money they have, for "jamais mal acquest ne proufite," Banville's thoughts fly to distant ages and distant climes. "Volons, charmés, vers les Dieux primitifs!" this is his invitation; and his burden; "Embarquons-nous pour la belle Cythère." The "Ballade sur les chanteurs" (no. 33) and that which follows it, the "Ballade de la joyeuse chanson du cor" do not point to any specific lines or poems in Villon, but their note of gay freedom (Banville calls his hunters "francs bohémiens") may be contrasted with the celebrated stanza in the *Grand testament* in which Villon, in a tone of somewhat roguish remorse, regrets his wild youth.[11]

There remain three of the "trente-six ballades" which have not yet been mentioned, and which may be placed in one rubric because they are written in a tone of either counsel or irony. The "Ballade de la bonne doctrine" (no. 3) has already been contrasted with Villon's ballad of the same name. The "Double ballade pour les bonnes gens" (no. 20), with its bitter attack upon the wealthy and its prayer that "Dieu fasse aux bons miséricorde" would seem to be somewhat distantly related to Villon's "Ballade des povres housseurs."[12] The "Double ballade des sottises de Paris" (no. 22) might be placed beside the "Ballade des femmes de Paris;"

[11] Stanzas 22-26.

[12] Poésies diverses, *Oeuvres*, p. 146.

finally, the "Ballade à Georges Rochegrosse" (no. 23), with its admonitory refrain: "Souviens-toi bien de cela, Georges," calls to mind the "Problème ou ballade au nom de la fortune," where the refrain runs: "Par mon conseil, prends tout en gré, Villon."

With Villon always as his model for form and Rabelais frequently his model for treatment,[13] Banville has added his own distinctly original note in the composition of his *Trente-six ballades joyeuses,* thereby fulfilling his promise to "faire renaître la ballade ancienne dans une fille vivante et créér la ballade nouvelle."[14] We have, in short, a composite very similar to that revealed in Banville's theatrical masterpiece, *Gringoire,* a work that was practically contemporaneous with the *Trente-six ballades joyeuses.*[15]

AARON SCHAFFER.

The University of Texas.

CAUSALITY IN *SAMSON AGONISTES*

Samson Agonistes like *Paradise Lost* has given rise to fresh discussion. P. F. Baum[1] has presented a theory opposed to that of J. W. Tupper.[2] His procedure has been unusual in that he fails to name his modern opponent, who is a well-known authority on English drama, and for some reason he deems it wise to concentrate his disapproval on Samuel Johnson. Of late years, critics have been readjusting their views of the Great Cham, and finding after

[13] In the "Ballade de la sainte buverie," Banville refers to "maître François," and the refrain reads: "C'est Rabelais qui nous verse du vin."

[14] Cf. Avant-propos to the *Trente-six ballades nouvelles.*

[15] For a brief discussion of the Villon-Gringore-Banville composite in the characterization of the hero of this play, cf. the introduction to the present writer's edition of *Gringoire,* New York, 1921, p. xxi. Some mention is also made there of Banville's indebtedness to Villon's "Epitaphe en forme de ballade" in the composition of his "Ballade des pendus." Other ballads by Banville, outside of the "Trente-six," that show the obvious influence of Villon are the "Ballade de la vraie sagesse," the "Ballade aux célébrités du temps jadis" and the one whose refrain runs "Aux pauvres gens tout est peine et misère."

[1] *PMLA.,* XXXV, 375-389.

[2] *PMLA.,* XXXVI, 354-371.

all that many of his opinions are practical and sensible. We must weigh carefully most of Johnson's dicta still, though we need not believe him infallible. We cannot reject a judgment merely because Johnson pronounced it. Especially ought we to act with caution when we consider his criticisms of drama. Though he does not appear to have had a most liberal attitude toward imaginative possibilities in plays, he did have an acquaintance with both classical and English drama that many a modern specialist might envy. He attempted unsuccessfully a classical play, *Irene*. He edited Shakspere. He was intimately acquainted with Goldsmith and other playwrights of his time, and he was a conspicuous attendant at Garrick's theatre. His equipment was therefore ample. His intellectual acumen is unmistakeable. To-day we cannot afford cursorily to dismiss his judgment on so important and plain a matter as the question whether a play has a middle. Yet Dr. Baum has snubbed Johnson.

Johnson declared that *Samson Agonistes* lacks a middle. Aristotle and others have insisted that a play should have a middle. Professor Tupper has supported Johnson in finding that Milton's tragedy has no middle. Dr. Baum, however, declares that such is not its defect. Both he and Dr. Tupper feel great admiration for the work as literature. The present paper does not aim to point out the numerous astounding merits of the play, such as the emotional effect of the choruses, but to examine the views of the recent critics.

Dr. Baum asserts that *Samson Agonistes* is weak because it is "tame," because it lacks conflict: "the essence of tragic action is conflict." This is the Hegelian contention, the difficulty with which is that conflict is not the essence. In fact it depends for its value structurally and "spiritually" upon the principle of causality; it is a mode or aspect of causality. Though we may admit to tragedy a small element of chance, we must emphasize causal relations, whether we see them in human character, in human acts, or in interference by a superhuman power.[3] Causal

[3] Just as literature in the last hundred years has reacted toward scientific progress and philosophy, so the Greek drama of the fifth century B. C. reacted toward the advance in philosophy up to Socrates and Plato. The pre-Socratics engaged diligently in the study of causation, and advanced various theories as to the initial cause. They agreed that life bears an

motivation is familiar to students of the structure of plays and of short stories; Thomas Hardy, it will be remembered, has expressed a wish to see it applied more frequently and more strictly to novels. The steps of causation may be in immediate causal sequence, or may act independently but directly upon the catastrophe for a co-operative effect. The following diagram will make clear divergent methods of handling causation in plots. A combination of both is often employed.

a) 1 > 2 > 3 > 4 > 5 (which may be catastrophe)
1 >
2 >
b) 3 > 5 (which may be catastrophe)
4 >

In *Samson Agonistes* Milton either followed causality or did not. To be dramatic as distinguished from spectacular or imaginative or inspiring, he as author would have to employ causal relations and to make them clear. That he did not do so, in either action or character, save briefly in the first episode that handles Manoa, is the view of Dr. Tupper. The plot, he believes, is stationary, and so essentially is the mood. The issue of causality Dr. Baum does not appreciate and face. He eludes it by speaking of a lack of improbability, by enforcing absence of conflict, by comparing the work with classical dramas, by declaring Milton's material intractable.

As to probability, the first item, Dr. Baum does not realize that it must be positive, not negative; the sequence, to be sure, is not always necessary, that is, fixed; two or more solutions may be possible from some premises. They must be such as we can deem possible and probable. Thus the solution of Manoa seems possible and probable up to Samson's decision; but the solution offered by Dalila is improbable, all the more because the solution of Manoa has been lost, and also in consequence of the fact that Samson has plainly been for a long time quite adverse to her. Not for the world would I lose the portrayal of Dalila, which is scarcely matched in literature. It is tremendously effective, but it is not

aspect which they called causation. (To what degree they were right has been debated by philosophers ever since.) Similarly the Greek tragic poets found the principle of causation essential to their dramas.

dramatic in this play. It would go well for an imaginary conversation or for a dramatic lyric, but it is not introduced to cause the catastrophe, through either deed or character, though it might have been made to do so. Likewise, the episode with Harapha does not contribute to the probability or the inevitability of the catastrophe. The giant is distinctly less interesting than Dalila; the employment of him brings about an anticlimax. He is cowardly, and therefore is unworthy of Samson; he is not valuable for emphasis near the end of the drama, because physical strength is not impressive or intellectual as Milton treats it here, is not so subtle or so spiritual as the episodes with Dalila and Manoa. Yet the Harapha episode might have been used to forward the action and effect the catastrophe.

Dr. Baum's second defense against the "Johnsonian shifts" is that the play lacks conflict. Conflict, as I have indicated, rests on the basis of causality. It is an admirable method of developing in an interesting fashion a series of dramatic scenes. But it is not so fundamental as causality.

His third apology for Milton relies on adducing instances from the Greek masters, whom he assumes without warrant Dr. Tupper has not read. He devotes considerable space to refreshing our acquaintance with the structural similarity between *Samson Agonistes* and the *Prometheus Bound* of Aeschylus. This is an unfortunate example for several reasons. In the first place, we cannot defend a modern drama which is complete in itself by comparing it with a drama which is an organic part of a trilogy. Aspects of the *Prometheus* might be quite different if we were able to know fully the details of the trilogy. Such is the situation for any critic today, whether or not Milton thought of the fact. In addition, the Greek drama is more organic than Dr. Baum indicates. The play seeks to establish as strongly as possible Prometheus' side in his controversy with Zeus. As it opens, it reveals the hero in woe. Kratos, who directs his enchainment, shows that Zeus is physically powerful; Hephaestus reinforces our idea of Zeus's might, because he does his work in spite of sympathy for Prometheus. The chorus, composed of the daughters of Oceanus, who is related to Prometheus by marriage, would comfort the afflicted rebel, but he is determined in his righteousness, and will admit no error (herein behaving unlike Samson). Oceanus then comes to

offer his relative practical aid. He finds, however, that he cannot do so, because the hero proves that Zeus will not relent. Thus the solution he suggests is not possible; it even might involve Oceanus also in trouble. By this episode, therefore, the final disaster is made more ominous, fearful, and certain. Next Io enters to reveal Zeus's injustice when the supreme deity does not hate, but favors. Her episode magnifies the danger of Prometheus' position, making it more awe-inspiring. In her, nevertheless, the hero sees hope, namely, the source of the agency that will bring about his release. (In this way the release in another play of the trilogy is in part motivated.) Moreover, Prometheus' prediction to Io of a marriage which will injure Zeus causes Hermes to come as a messenger from the despotic god, and finally Prometheus' refusal to answer Hermes' question about the marriage brings on with the close of the play a catastrophe of increased torture for the hero. By the episodes of Oceanus and Io the catastrophe of the play has been made more inevitable, more terrible, and because of them the audience will look forward to the next play in the trilogy. The principle of causality is far more apparent in *Prometheus Bound* than in *Samson Agonistes.*

The Libation-Bearers yields satisfactorily to an examination for causal relationship, and is moreover an organic part of a trilogy. *The Suppliants* is plainly motivated. Dr. Baum's other examples from the three tragic Greek masters may be similarly analyzed.

Yet we need not hesitate to admit that some Greek tragedies were weak in causation; but though they were weak dramatically, they were not of necessity weak as spectacles. *Samson Agonistes* is weak in the Harapha incident, which is a poor scene to witness. *The Persians* is not thus affected. Moreover, its theme has a broad basis, and appeals to many universal feelings. We can imagine plots different from that used, which should portray the prodigious reversal and downfall of a man seemingly secure of fortune. Aeschylus, however, chose a plot which in scene would contrast sharply with the spectators who would attend the production of his play at Athens and with the setting which nature afforded as background to the theatre. An audience composed of citizens who were not under the power of an insolent monarch looked in imagination at the sorrows which a society experienced in a distant realm. They had an intimate vision of the life at a court which

held its position to be supreme on earth. The Athenians witnessed not merely the fall of a man from fortune but the defeat of an empire. They saw the suffering of their enemies at a remote Persian palace, while from where they sat they could gaze off at will over land which led to the sea-shore. Just beyond neighboring hills on the horizon lay, as they knew, the gulf and the island of Salamis, and the site of their tremendous victory over the Persian multitudes, the site of the triumph of free citizens over an imperial navy. The contrasts were brilliantly effected. In themselves they suffice as a defense for the existence of the play. But they do not make the play dramatic in the true sense. The problem of motivation is different, and though it would be possible to defend the play on such ground, I do not need to go into the problem now. But *Samson Agonistes* does not consistently produce non-dramatic results so emotionally effective as those of *The Persians.*

Lastly, Dr. Baum defends *Samson Agonistes* by declaring that the material is obstinate, that it will not allow of dramatic treatment. This contention cannot be admitted. There are a number of possibilities whereby the play can be made causal and dramatic. One of these may appear a trifle obvious upon examination. Its effectiveness as poetry would depend upon Milton. I shall not change Milton's order of episodes, because I can secure causal motivation without further changes, and a climactic arrangement is another problem altogether, though easy of solution. The plot can be handled thus:

Have the Manoa episode bring about the catastrophe more clearly than it does now. Alter the episode of Dalila so that she goes indignantly to the Philistines in order to report Samson's attitude. Similarly make the Harapha episode causal. Then if desirable for absolute clarity, alter the messenger's report of the catastrophe. Suppose that a Philistine council is in session. Let Manoa appear before it, trying to get Samson released by ransom. While the council is inclining favorably to his plea, let Dalila come with her complaints and render the issue doubtful. Have the balance still sway indecisively up to the entrance of Harapha with additional reports of Samson's insolence. Let his news rouse the council to a denial of Manoa's plea (Manoa having left the presence in the meantime, however), and to a decision to humiliate Samson further.

Thus the catastrophe is motivated from beginning to end, and the material is not found intractable.

Examination of Dr. Baum's views, therefore, shows that several of them are untenable. For a play to have a middle, it must have causal motivation, such as *Samson Agonistes* lacks to a large degree. The want cannot be defended by an asseveration that something else is missing, to wit, conflict. Nor should ancient plays, especially if they are imperfect by the standards of Aristotle, be advanced to excuse defects in Milton, who was not forced by circumstances to write a play at all hazards, and who was familiar enough with Shakspere, Jonson, and other Elizabethan dramatists to realize that they employed causality, even if he himself did not discover any necessity to do so in his own case. Moreover, the ancient examples that Dr. Baum has most emphasized he has not carefully studied as parts of trilogies or as units. Finally, we cannot allow the defense that Milton's material was intractable.

Dr. Baum has made interesting and sound observations as to the play, but he has not succeeded in ousting Dr. Tupper from his central position wherein he contends that the play lacks a middle, and that this defect is in marked degree the cause of our dissatisfaction with it as a drama.

E. C. Knowlton.

Ohio Wesleyan University.

THE WIFE OF BATH'S TALE, WOMEN PLEASED, AND *LA FÉE URGELE:* A STUDY IN THE TRANSFORMATION OF FOLK-LORE THEMES IN DRAMA

Fletcher: 1579-1625.—*Woman Pleased:*—"*Women Pleased* was, in all likelihood, wholly composed by Fletcher. The date of its first production on the stage has not been discovered." [1]

Favart, Charles Simon: 1710-1792.—*La Fée Urgele:*—The title-page says: "Représentée devant Leurs Majestés, par les Comédiens Italiens ordinaires du Roi, à Fontainebleau, le 26 Octobre 1765. Et à Paris le 4 Décembre suivant."

The date of publishing of the copy used, as given at the foot of the title-page, was 1765.

---

[1] Dyce's edition, *Beaumont and Fletcher*, London, 1844: Vol. 7, p. 3.

If one were curious to know how Chaucer's *Wife of Bath's Tale* looks in dramatic dress, two excellent examples are afforded by Fletcher's *Women Pleased* and Favart's *La Fée Urgele*. Though the differences between the two plays are what strike one most, there is at least one curious resemblance.

In Fletcher's play, Belvidere, the girl, is discovered in the embrace of Silvio, her lover. There is no question of a rape. Silvio is banished for a year, and a scroll is given him, in which a question is written: if he answers this question satisfactorily within the year, Belvidere shall be his wife; if he does not, he shall lose his head. We do not learn what the question is.

Belvidere, however, worms the answer to the question from her mother, flies the castle, and appears before Silvio, "disguised as a deformed old woman." She pretends to be a witch and says:

> A thousand leagues I have cut through empty air,
> Far swifter than the sailing rack that gallops
> Upon the wings of angry winds, to seek thee.

Silvio, of course, does not recognize her and believes her to be endowed with extraordinary powers from heaven. Belvidere promises to be near when the time comes for him to answer the question and exacts from him a promise to grant what she will ask when her help has been given him.

At the moment of the trial, we have the following stage direction: "Enter Belvidere, disguised as before, who secretly gives Silvio a paper, and exit." It is not until this point (in Act 5, scene I) that we first discover what the question is (substantially the same as Chaucer's) and, at the same time, its answer.

Silvio having answered the question satisfactorily, Belvidere re-enters, still disguised. She claims the fulfillment of his promise, which is, to be her husband. Silvio at first objects strenuously, but finally acquiesces. Belvidere exit, but again re-enters, this time in her proper figure. She still holds off, however, propounding to Silvio the question, Will he have her fair and false or foul and true? Silvio replies: "Into thy sovereign will I put my answer." Belvidere rewards him by being just herself, which is all she had power to be anyway.

In *La Fée Urgele* the stage direction standing at the very beginning of the play is: "Le Théâtre représente un Paysage des plus

agréables. On voit dans l'éloignement le Palais du Roi Dagobert." In other words, the setting, from the very beginning and throughout, is pastoral.

Enter Marton, a young girl, and her companion, Robinette. It appears that Marton has designs in the way of marriage on a certain Chevalier Robert, who is expected to pass that way. She meets him with a basket of flowers on her arm. He offers her "vingt écus" for the flowers and a kiss. He takes the kiss (here again there is no question of rape), but, his horse and baggage being stolen at that moment (he is a poor knight and carries his patrimony with him without difficulty), he is unable to pay the "vingt écus."

Marton determines to accuse Robert to *La Reine Berthe*. Robinette remonstrates: "Ah! le pauvre Robert! Vous allez l'accuser?" Marton replies: "C'est un moyen pour l'épouser." Robert is condemned to death by the court of Queen Bertha, unless he tells "ce qui séduit les femmes en tout tems."

He comes upon a number of *villageoises* dancing. They dance off the stage and leave in their place *une petite vieille ratatinée*. The old woman knows his trouble without being told. She receives from him his oath to grant what she will ask, and, promising to reveal the answer to his question as they go, sets out with him to the court of Queen Bertha.

The Chevalier answers the question to the satisfaction of the court, and the old woman demands him for her husband. He, of course, seeks to escape such a consequence, but to no avail.

Alone together in the old woman's tumble-down little house, Robert has difficulty schooling himself to receive her advances. He tells her that the image of Marton will not from him. His wife pretends to die of unrequited love, and Robert, stricken with remorse, beseeches her to live: he begs her to dispose of his lot, and he will abandon Marton. At this point, the scene breaks off, and the following stage direction introduces the new scene: "Le Théâtre change au bruit du Tonnerre, la Chaumiere est transformée en un Palais magnifique, & la Fée Urgele paraît sur un Trône brillant, environnée de Nymphes de sa suite." In other words, la Fée Urgele appears in her own person, at the same time (as we learn a moment later) bearing a marked resemblance to

Marton, and the Knight realizes that his dearest wishes have been gratified. The fée says to Robert:

> J'ai trop joui de ton erreur.
> La Vieille était Marton, & Marton est Urgele.

The most striking resemblance between Fletcher and Favart and also perhaps the most striking difference of the two from Chaucer is found in the importance given to the girl whom the Knight meets at the very beginning of the story. Instead of appearing only at the beginning for a moment, as a sort of machine, merely, to start the story on its way, she becomes of central importance in the narrative; she is from the beginning, and remains throughout, the Knight's sweetheart, and far from being the persecuted recipient of his unwelcome attentions, she rather is the pursuer.

But the most valuable lesson to be drawn from the contrast of the two plays with each other and with Chaucer is that of what happens when a dramatist, going to a folk-lore theme for his plot, ignores the supernatural element in it. Fletcher's plot is irreparably inconsequent. Why, we may ask, does Belvidere come to her lover disguised when she knows he is wild to see her? Why should she make him promise to marry her when she knows he is wild to do that too? Why should she wait till the last minute before telling him the answer to the question and then write it? Why should she, in her own person, put the question fair and false or foul and true when she knows and he knows that she is just plain mortal and has no power to be either fairer or fouler or more or less faithful than as a matter of fact she is? The answer to these questions, of course, is that Belvidere was originally a superhuman being. But Fletcher's audience does not know this, nor should it need to; being presented with a realistic drama, it has the right to demand of him realistic motivation of character.

Favart, on the other hand, has chosen the wiser part of frankly accepting the whole original story and giving it a setting congenial to its supernatural foundation.

George McGill Vogt.

Harvard University.

UNACKNOWLEDGED POEMS BY THOMAS CAMPBELL

Thomas Campbell was editor of the *New Monthly Magazine* from 1821 to 1830, and during these years contributed numerous poems to the publication. These bits of verse usually were signed with his name, but in a few instances this was not the case. His biographer William Beattie, in giving a list of the poems by Campbell in the magazine during 1821 and 1822, makes the specific statement that some other pieces by him appeared in these numbers of the periodical, but were not acknowledged.[1] Now, if we examine the volumes during these two years, we discover four poems signed *C*. If we continue our search, moreover, through the remaining years of Campbell's editorship, we find seven other poems apearing at intervals with the same signature. Now of these eleven poetic waifs, some have been claimed elsewhere for Campbell. Beattie admits that *Florine* (1830)[2] is by the poet and he adds that it was published with his name in an annual.[3] Again, *The Farewell to Love* (1829),[4] though not acknowledged originally, was included during Campbell's life time in the London edition of 1840, showing that the author was at last willing to claim it as his. Finally, the *Lines Written in Sickness* (1822),[5] though not in this volume, is to be found in some other editions (e. g., Baltimore, 1833), a fact indicating that though the author did not approve of the work thoroughly, he must have signed his name to it somewhere, as for instance, in an annual. Now since three of these eleven pieces are surely by Campbell, it seems only natural that the other eight having the same signature *C* are likewise his. I shall characterize them briefly, indicating how far they resemble his acknowledged pieces and in what ways, if any, they are different.

[1] II, 412, of W.. Beattie, *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, 3 vols., London, 1849. This book is the original authority for the poet's life since Beattie, who knew Campbell personally very well, received from him all the letters, notes, and other information to make the biography authoritative.

[2] The *New Monthly Magazine*, XXIX, 336.

[3] Beattie, III, 70.

[4] The *New Monthly Magazine*, XXVI, 490.

[5] *Id.*, IV, 199.

A *Song* (1822)[6] of thirty lines beginning *Must I drink a health to thee* describes the superiority of the poet's lady to the majority of his friends. It is typical of Campbell's love verse in running smoothly and being pretty, though conventional, and it is quite the equal of his usual amatory pieces. *The Fragment from My Pocket-Book* (1822),[7] a work of ten lines, is the dedication to the poet's lady and to the moon of what was evidently going to be a long poem. It is printed on the same page of the magazine as the *Lines Written in Sickness,* and the two pieces are extremely alike in tone, though neither resembles Campbell's other productions much. The mood of both is more strongly romantic than is usual with him and somewhat resembles that of Keats, though of course we can not assume any influence. Presumably Campbell is trying his hand at a new type of verse, but the result is only moderately successful. Another *Song* (1822)[8] of eight lines beginning *In my heart Love has built him a bower* is like Campbell's usual amatory verse in being musical and pretty. It has, moreover a note of humor in the fancy that Love is asleep in the poet's heart and must be awakened by having his nose tweaked by the lady. Thus it perhaps resembles *When Love came first to Earth* more than any other of his acknowledged poems. Again *A Foreign Soldier's Farewell to his English Mistress* (1823),[9] a piece of sixteen lines, is characteristic of Campbell in combining sentiment with some degree of vigor, but the result is not remarkable as literature. A *Song* (1823)[10] beginning *Oh how hard it is to find,* a poem of twelve lines lamenting the fate of lovers whose ladies are false to them, is not at all noteworthy in thought, but is fairly graceful in manner and has Campbell's usual note of sentiment. Another *Song* (1825)[11] of twelve lines beginning *Whither wilt thou roam—ah, whither,* is a lament for a faithless lover and is slightly better than the preceding poem. Its merits are of the same order,—that is, it is graceful and pretty in sentiment, but is lacking in real feeling. *A Family Group* (1827),[12] a poem of forty-six lines in heroic couplets, is a description of a stately old man and his wife with their lovely daughter all sitting in an

[6] *Id.*, IV, 163.
[7] *Id.*, IV, 199.
[8] *Id.*, IV, 454.
[9] *Id.*, VIII, 76.
[10] *Id.*, VIII, 568.
[11] *Id.*, XIV, 379.
[12] *Id.*, XIX, 183.

elegantly decorated room. Though not at all noteworthy, the production is fairly creditable. It resembles parts of an acknowledged poem of the next year entitled *The Departure of Emigrants for New South Wales,* since both use the heroic couplet and both give detailed descriptions of every day life, though the people in *A Family Group* belong to a higher social class. Finally *The Course of the Prophecy* (1829) [13] is an account in thirty-four lines of the predictions of Christ's coming. It is unlike anything of Campbell's, but in its use of blank verse and its general trend of thought suggests that he was attempting an imitation of Milton. In particular the influence of Milton seems clear in the lines:

> it [the heavenly voice] was borne along
> From Lebanon to Carmel and throughout
> Sandy Judea to the purple shores
> Of Tyre (now ruin'd) by the silver sea.

Thus the poem shows that Campbell was at this time interested in a meter which he was to use two years afterward in one of the best of his later works, *The St. Leonard's Lines.* In this second poem, however, he abandoned Milton and chose a new poet as his master.

No one of these eight poems can be considered of striking merit, but many of them are fairly graceful and pretty, and several are quite as good as some of the acknowledged works. Six of the eight are similar in mood to others of Campbell's poems. The other two, *The Fragment from my Pocket-Book* and *The Course of the Prophecy,* are significant in that they indicate a reaching out for something new. The acknowledged poems during the 1820-1830 period often indicate a similar tendency, and thus we can clearly see that during these years Campbell was experimenting in handling types of poetry that he had not essayed before.

Albert Morton Bierstadt.

University of Wisconsin.

---

[13] *Id.,* xxv, 80.

NOTES ON *KING LEAR*[1]

King Lear—I, iv, 356.

A writer in *Modern Language Review* v (1910), 445-453, thinks (p. 449) that there is an inconsistency between "I have writ my sister" and "have you writ that letter to my sister?" (359), as Lear has "uttered" nothing to the purpose, that we know, except during this scene. There is no real difficulty when the passage is properly acted.

"What he hath uttered" means the last two lines of Lear's final speech (333-334). As Goneril says to her husband "Do you mark that," she moves to a desk or table and during the lines 338-355 writes a postscript to the letter which she has already dictated to Oswald to write (I, iii, 26 and I, iv, 359), this *postscript* containing a further warning based on Lear's final threat and also perhaps on the Fool's last fling which serves her as an example of the boldness and dangerousness of Lear's following. Regan perhaps required no prompting as to "the riotous knights that tend upon" her father (II, i, 96). But Goneril is making out her case, playing the game of parricide. As she says "if she sustain him &c," we may suppose that she folds her postscript and a moment later hands it to Oswald with instructions to supplement it verbally himself.

Who Was Burgundy?

I, i, 36, 47, &c.—Shakespeare first introduced a Lord of Burgundy into the Lear story. In the old play of Leir, Cordelia had been "solicited by divers peers," none of whom "her partial fancy hears." Shakespeare's Burgundy appears as a worldly, arrogant person, the foil to the chivalrous lover, France, who instructs him with polite scorn on the nature of love.

But why should Shakespeare have invented a Burgundy to stand thus in invidious contrast to the old enemy of England? In the chronicles Burgundy would appear as the traditional friend. The truth seems to be that Shakespeare intends not the Burgundy of Philip and Charles the Bold as a whole but the Imperial "Circle

[1] References to "the Oxford Shakespeare."

of Burgundy" of the sixteenth century, embracing the Netherlands and Franche Comté, all which in 1605 had been for fifty years a possession of Spain. Holding these dominions, Philip II and Philip IV called themselves "Duke of Burgundy," successors to Charles the Bold.[2] The most characteristic part of the old duchy had been incorporated in France since 1477.

A recent editor of *King Lear* is puzzled to see any point in the distinction between "The milk of Burgundy and the vines of France" (l. 86), "as Burgundy was as famous for wine as France." But Moberly suggested long ago that by Burgundy Shakespeare means "southern Belgium," which was "part of Burgundy till the death of Charles the Bold." It was still, in a way, part of Philip's "Duchy of Burgundy" at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Not only in line 86 but later in line 261 Shakespeare points the contrast between the "waterish" Belgian pastures and French wines. Not the wine-growing Côte d'Or region, then, nor particularly the high, waterless country of Franche Comté is meant by Burgundy in this play, but Belgium.

Who then was "duke of Burgundy"? Practically the Spanish king. In the back of his head, at least, Shakespeare had him identified with Burgundy. Is it any wonder that such a person should be presented in a bad light? Spain had become the particular enemy of England, in comparison with whom France might be portrayed as amiable. That part of Spanish dominion which most closely concerned England was waterish Belgium, whose sufferings under tyrannous misrule are indicated in the Fifth Book of *The Faerie Queene*. Spain in Belgium was the national peril of Shakespeare's day. He might have been severer in his characterization of such a Burgundy, but like his Cordelia, is mild in word. With his audience, a Burgundian, *i. e.* a Spanish, marriage for a British princess was as unpopular as anything could be. France was much to be preferred, as King James later found out.

King Lear—IV, ii, 62-3.

Thou changèd and self-cover'd thing, etc.

These lines should be interpreted in connection with Albany's immediately preceding speech. It is difficult to suppose with some

[2] Philip III held Burgundy through his sister Isabella.

of the editors that at such a moment, when Albany is rising at last in dignity and fierce rebellion against his overbearing partner, he should devote a particular attention to her scowls. "Don't *look* so devilish" is the interpretation of Bradley, Verity, &c.

I would suggest:—"Changed from what I fondly saw in you, fiend still disguised in so fair a shape, for shame, make not your woman's form the house of a devil; such kenneling is an enormity, so unnatural as to be monstrous" (cf. I, i, 222-223, "That monsters it"). Albany had just exclaimed (59-61) that the devil was in this woman; in 62-63 he is remarking further on the monstrosity of such a phenomenon as the fiend's inhabiting the form of Goneril so fair in his eyes.

For "thing" as fiend see IV, vi, 68: "what thing was that?" and 73: "It was some fiend." For Goneril's beauty as hiding a devil or serpent cp. V, iii, 85, "This gilded serpent."

Albany has been and still is in love with his wife's stately, formidable beauty, "that pulse's magnificent come-and-go." The only way of understanding his distraction later in the closing scene after the death of Goneril is to consider that the poisoned love then surges up in him again. At this present juncture of revolt he wonders how the Goneril he had loved can be or harbor also this fiend. Bidding her not to be the monster of a devil in woman's form, he realizes that she *is*, and proceeds to say that *only* this woman's form, however "bemonstered" by its inhabitant within, keeps him from killing her.

King Lear—V, i, 33 ff.

When Koppel suggests that Edmund leave the stage only after "overtake you" in line 39, he considers that Edmund is then making not for Regan's headquarters but directly for Albany's tent. But when Edmund said (33), "I shall attend you presently at your tent," his meaning ought to be that he would first go to Regan's tent and then without delay to Albany's; the next line (34), spoken by Regan, naturally means that she is going with him and asks Goneril to accompany them.

I would, then, interpret thus:—Saying "I shall attend you presently at your tent," Edmund starts to go in the direction of Regan's tent, Regan turning to go with him and taking his arm.

Reflecting, however, that Goneril left with Albany may be present at the Council of War and perhaps gain a tactical advantage over her in winning some precious moments with Edmund, she halts, looks back sweetly over her shoulder, and invites her sister to go with them. Goneril, glowering at Regan's present point of vantage, snaps out a curt "no"; she does not propose to be made to play "gooseberry,"—rather stay with her husband! But partly in jealous anxiety, partly in malicious enjoyment, Regan persists: "'Tis most convenient," that is, plausibly suggests that during the Council of War about to meet, Goneril will have more of feminine privacy in Regan's quarters. Then it rushes over Goneril's mind not only that her sister is jealous, but that complying with her invitation she will have a chance on her own part of watching Regan and of poisoning her in her tent: such seems the meaning of "I know the riddle," spoken venomously, perhaps aside as Capell proposed. Accordingly, she moves off with Regan and Edmund, covering the latter with a conquering glance. At the same time Albany and his men move in another direction, towards his tent. But just then Edgar enters, and stopping to hear him Albany says to his followers that he will overtake them.

What Edmund does at Regan's quarters is suggested in lines 51 ff. He gets a paper, which he brings to Albany, showing the reports of his scouts. He has also perhaps had Goneril put her signature to a warrant for the execution of Lear and Cordelia: cf. l. 67, "they within our power, &c" and V, iii, 254. The time for these proceedings between 37 and 51 may seem a little short, but time is the most elastic thing in Shakespeare. Returning towards Albany's tent and overtaking him delayed by Edgar, the arch-villain delivers his paper and announces also that there is now no time for a council-of-war, apparently anxious not to have the subject of Lear and Cordelia discussed, and eager to be in the fight which may bring him a throne.

W. F. Tamblyn.

Western University,
London, Canada.

THE MARE AND THE WOLF

"As the mare said to the wolf: 'The most learned are not the wisest men.'" Thus Chaucer's Miller (*CT.* A 4055). The fable implied here has of course long been identified; but inasmuch as it is really the result of a combination of two separate fables and the references one finds to its appearance in this or that collection overlook or obscure the distinctions, it is perhaps worth while to trace briefly the early history of the two motifs and their union.

The central motif, that of the kick, appears by itself in the fable of the Lion and the Horse. A Lion, claiming to be a doctor, approaches a horse; the horse however is suspicious, pretends to welcome him on account of a sore foot, and, when the Lion is examining the afflicted member, knocks him over. This occurs in the early Latin collection which goes under the name of Romulus and in most of its derivates, *e. g.*, the eleventh-century Vienna Romulus, the so-called Romulus of Nilant (both the prose and the verse redactions), the Anonymus Neveleti often assigned to Gualterius Anglicus, the Novus Æsopus of Alexander Neckam (d. 1217), and others.[1] The same story, moreover, having a wolf for the Lion and an Ass for the Horse occurs in the Greek Aesop and its descendants.[2]

[1] Romulus, Book III, fable 2: Hervieux, *Les Fabulistes Latins*, 2nd edition, Paris, 1893, I, 307, 332, II, 214; Vienna Romulus, Hervieux I, 697, II, 435, 470; Romulus of Nilant, in prose, Hervieux, I, 709, II, 532, in verse, I, 802, 810, II, 682, 735; Gualt. Angl., Hervieux I, 496, II, 336, 360; Neckam, Hervieux I, 673, II, 405. See also Hervieux I, 776; II, 173, 256, 493, 583. For a Catalan version see *Histories d'altre Temps* IV, ed. R. Miquel y Planas, Barcelona, 1908, p. 106 f. The Ysopet versions are printed by A. C. M. Robert, *Fables Inédites*, I, 319 ff. Fuller bibliographical details, especially for later forms of the fables, and accounts of the interrelations of the various groups may be found in Robert's Introduction, in vol. I of J. Jacob's edition of Caxton's *Esope*, in Hervieux, and in H. L. D. Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, II, 272 ff.

[2] Aesop, ed. Halm, no. 334; ed. Furia, Florence, 1809, no. 134 (cf. also the same fable in different words, Furia, no. 140); Aphthonias, no. 9 and Gabrias, no. 38 (in Nivelet, Mythologia Æsopica, London, 1682); *Roman de Renart* ll. 7521 ff. (ed. Méon, Paris, 1826, p. 281 ff.). For further references see DuMéril, *Poésies Inédites du Moyen âge*, Paris, 1854, p. 195;

An entirely different fable, found in the *Disciplina Clericalis* of Petrus Alphonsi, tells of a Mule who when asked about his origin proudly declares himself 'one of God's creatures'; when pressed further, boasts of his grandfather (or uncle or mother); but refuses to admit his father was an Ass.[3]

Then these two fables are united, as in Jacques de Vitry (d. 1244) and Etienne de Bourbon (d. ca. 1261). A Fox asks a Mule what sort of animal he is. 'What is that to you?' replies the Mule; 'I am one of God's creatures.' The Fox asks again, and the Mule says he is a grandson of one of the King of Spain's steeds. 'But who were your father and your mother?' persists the Fox. Exasperated, the Mule answers, 'You will find my whole genealogy written on my hoof'; and kills him with a violent kick.[4]

The fable *De Vulpe et Mulo* seems to be an slightly elaborated version of this. A Fox comes upon a Mule feeding and says, 'Who are you?' The Mule replies, 'Bestia sum.' 'I didn't mean that. Who was your father?' 'I am descended from a horse,' says the Mule. 'Yes, but what is your name?' 'That I don't know,' answers the Mule; 'I was only a little fellow when my father died. But it is written on my left hind foot.' At this the Fox scents danger and retires to the woods; where he meets a Wolf, who was his enemy, lying in the shade nearly overcome with

Robert, *Fables Inédites* I, p. 319 ff. (La Fontaine, v, 8); and Guillon's edition of La Fontaine I, p. 279; and *Ysengrimus*, ed. E. Voigt, Halle, 1884, p. lxxxiii.

[3] *Disciplina Clericalis*, ed. F. W. V. Schmidt, p. 42 (notes, p. 103); ed. Hilka-Söderhjelm, Helsingfors, 1911, I, Latin text, p. 9, II, French prose text, p. 7; French verse redaction, *Castoiement*, ed. Soc. des Bibliophiles Fr., Paris, 1824, p. 32 ff., ll. 76 ff.; Juan Manuel, *El Libro de los Enxiemplos*, ed. Gayangos, Bibl. de Autores Españoles, LI, p. 478, no. 128. For later versions (including Abraham a Sancta Clara's *Judas der Ertzschelm*) see Schmidt's notes; Oesterley's notes in his edition of Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst*, Stuttgart, 1866, p. 493; and Robert, *Fables Inédites* II, p. 16 (La Fontaine, VI, 7). Guillon, in his edition of La Fontaine, cites also Plutarch, *Banquet of the Seven Sages* [150], but the resemblance is slight. Remote also is the fable of the Crocodile and the Wolf, Halm, no. 38, sometimes mentioned in this connection.

[4] A. Lecoy de la Marche, *L'Esprit de nos Aieux*, Paris [1888], p. 85; T. F. Crane, *Exempla of Jacques de Vitry*, London, 1890, pp. 13, 147. Professor Crane recognized that the fable is composed of two parts; I had finished the above note, however, before I saw his work.

hunger, and with taunts and exhortations persuades him to approach the Mule. The Wolf then asks the Mule the same questions, receives the same answers, unsuspectingly looks at the hoof, and gets his head broken.[5]

Practically the same story, but better told, appears in the *Cento Novelle Antiche* (compiled near the end of the thirteenth century), no. 94, with the moral—as in Chaucer—'not all who can read are wise.'[6] Since no other version has just this moral appended, one might suppose Chaucer was recalling this form of the fable. But the same story occurs in the Reynard poems with a similar though not so explicit tag and with a Mare in place of the Mule. This is quite decisive. Here Reynard and Isegrym meet a red mare with a black colt. At the bidding of Isegrym, who is very hungry, Reynard asks the mare if she will sell her daughter. 'Certainly,' says the Mare, 'it is quite the fashion to do so.' But when she tells him the price is written on her hind foot Reynard grows suspicious and calls the Wolf, flattering him on his knowledge of the languages.[7]

[5] Hervieux, II, 272, from a fifteenth-century MS.; cf. I, 465; not in the usual Romulus, but no. 1 of the *Fabulae Extravagantes* (for a shorter version see Hervieux, I, 469, II, 304); Steinhöwel, *Äsop*, ed. Oesterley, Stuttgart, 1873, p. 192; Hans Sachs, ed. von Keller, Stuttgart, 1875, IX, p. 140 ff.; and in Catalan in *Histories d'altre Temps* VI, *Faules Isopiques*.

[6] Ed. A. Marenduzzo, Milano, 1906, p. 95. This is sometimes referred to as no. 91 (as in the Borghini text). For additional references on this fable in oral tradition see D'Ancona, *Studj di Critica e Storia Letteraria*, Bologna, 1912, II, p. 140 f. Other similar versions are noted in Robert, *Fables Inédites* II, p. 365 (La Fontaine, XII, 17) and Guillon's edition of La Fontaine, II, p. 398. To which add Kirchhof's *Wendunmuth* IV, 138, an amusing version (ed. Oesterley, III, p. 128 f.; further references, VI, p. 113; and apparently also Luigi-Cinzio de' Fabrizzi, *Libro della Origine delle volgari Proverbj*, Venice, 1526, (N. V.); cf. *Jahrb. für rom. Lit.* I (1859), 311, 433.

[7] Willem's *Reinaert* (ca. 1250), II, 3994 ff. (ed. Martin, Paderborn, 1874, p. 215 ff.); the prose *Hystorie* (printed 1479), ch. XXVII (ed. Muller en Logeman, Zwolle, 1892, p. 80 f.); Caxton, ch. XXVII (ed. Arber, London, 1878, p. 62 f.; *Renart le Contrefait* (finished ca. 1342), ed. Raynaud et Lemaitre, Paris, 1914, II, p. 241 ff. This version was incorporated by Caxton in his *Esope* V, 10 (ed. J. Jacobs, I, p. 254, 255, II, p. 157, 179. Cf. also the Greek poem described by Gidel, *Etude sur la Littérature Grecque Moderne*, Paris, 1886, p. 331 ff. esp. p. 341 ff.

Thus the story seems to have grown. To the simple motif of the Horse or Ass outwitting the Lion or Wolf was added that of the boasting Mule and the Fox. Then the boasting motif was dropped and the Wolf reintroduced in order that the Fox might not be humiliated by a Mule (or Mare).

PAULL FRANKLIN BAUM.

Harvard University.

A SOURCE FOR GULLIVER'S FIRST VOYAGE

In *Modern Language Notes,* November, 1921, I noted several points of the influence of Lucian upon *Gulliver's Travels,* and more especially the influence of D'Ablancourt's sequel to Lucian's *True History.* From an entry in the *Journal to Stella* I was able to establish Swift's purchase of this French translation. Lucian's influence, however, was not confined to the *True History.* It is evident in at least two other satires, both of which are included in D'Ablancourt's translation.

One aspect of the satiric method in *Gulliver,* which hitherto has been regarded as original with Swift, is the satire of position which runs through the first two voyages, though it is carried through consistently only in the voyage to Lilliput. Briefly stated, the device is to reduce the scale of human life, and correspondingly to elevate the point of view, so as to render ridiculous all that is essentially petty. The machinery used is that of a giant among pygmies. This particular situation is original with Swift, though as I pointed out in the previous article the pygmy commonwealth was suggested by D'Ablancourt. The satiric idea, however, had been employed by Lucian in *Icaromenippus, or A Voyage to Heaven.* Menippus, describing his voyage to heaven, is asked by his friend to describe the appearance of the world from that altitude, and replies, in part, as follows:

"Fancy you see a small spot, not by so much as big as the moon, so that . . . one would wonder where were all those mighty mountains, those vast seas. . . . But more intently directing my eyes, I could discern all the transactions of human life, some sailing, some fighting, some plowing, some quarrelling. . . . To behold the actions of private persons is very odd and ridiculous . . . not to

mention others breaking their neighbors houses, lying with their wives, going to law, exacting usury; all which put together make a most ridiculous farce.

"Above all I could not but heartily laugh at those that contest the bounds of their countries, one taking pride in living in Licyon, another that he was master of a thousand acres in Acarnania. When all Greece appeared to me at that height not a span over, and Attica the least part of that too. I began to think what it was that men of estate value themselves upon, when he that had the most acres had no more than one of Epicurus' atoms. . . But the merriest of all was to see the wealthy men strut and look big with their rings, plate, etc., when the whole Pangaeum was no bigger than a millet-seed.

"(*Friend*) But the cities and the men in them, how do they appear?

"(*Men*) I suppose you have seen a nest of Pismires, some crowding together at home, some going abroad, others returning, others loading out ordure. . . . I believe too, since they compose a small republic, they may have architects, physicians, magistrates, philosophers amongst them, and other necessary members of society. Just like these animals do great cities appear." [1]

What Swift borrows here is after all just one idea, but it is an idea which motivates Gulliver's first voyage, and which does not appear elsewhere before the writing of *Gulliver's Travels.*

In Gulliver's visit to the land of the Struldbruggs, in the course of his third voyage, Swift reverses the sentiments of Cicero's *De Senectute,* and depicts the hideousness of old age, in language which is reminiscent of Lucian. In the satire entitled *On Mourning for the Dead,* a deceased son remonstrates with his father for his unreasonable grief:

"O wretched man, why dost thou create so much trouble for me? Forbear to pull off thy hair, and tear the skin from thy face. . . . Dost thou think it a misfortune to me that I did not live to become such an old man as thyself, with a bald pate, a wrinkled face, stooping in the back, feeble knees, and almost wholly rotten with age, having lived many Olympiads and at length brought to dotage before so many witnesses?" [2]

[1] Vol. 1, pages 312 ff. All quotations are from the Dryden *Lucian* published in 1711. More than half of the translating was done by Tom Brown, with whom Swift was personally acquainted, and from whose works he borrowed hints for satire in *Gulliver.* For a complete statement of Swift's debt to Lucian and Tom Brown, the reader is referred to my book, "Gulliver's Travels,—A Critical Study," not yet published.

[2] Vol. 1, pages 187-8.

This passage bears the closest verbal resemblance to Swift, but the entire satire is an elaboration of the thought that old age is a curse.

The same thought is expressed by Terpsio in the sixth *Dialogue of the Dead*:

"In my opinion (oh Pluto) the oldest ought to die first, and the rest in their turn successively, without permitting an old gouty dotard to live, after he has lost the use of his senses, and is at best but an animated tomb. . . . The grievance would be somewhat alleviated, if one could but know how long they were to live, that one might avoid a tedious and fruitless courtship." [3]

These last passages seem to have served as suggestions for the episode of the Struldbruggs, though they are by no means extensive sources. There can be no doubt that Swift knew his Lucian, though he drew upon the latter for occasional ideas, rather than for general method. The problem of the sources of *Gulliver* has been consistently ignored. In a future article I hope to throw some new light on the debt of Swift to Cyrano de Bergerac's *Histoire Comique des Etats et Empires du Soleil.*

William A. Eddy.

Princeton University.

REVIEWS

Cleanness, an Alliterative Tripartite Poem on the Deluge, the Destruction of Sodom, and the Death of Belshazzar, by the Poet of Pearl. Edited by Sir Israel Gollancz. *Select Early English Poems* VII. Oxford University Press, 1921.

Professor Gollancz's edition of *Cleanness* (*Purity*) differs from my own [1] in several respects: the poem is printed in quatrains, many emendations are introduced in the text, and the notes are, in general, limited to explanation of these emendations and of difficult words and phrases. A second volume is to contain a glossary and illustrative texts.

In the Preface, which summarizes what is known concerning the plan, date, and sources of the poem, the editor makes the new suggestion that in several passages, especially lines 148 ff., 697-708, 1129-48, the poet was influenced by the *Book of the Knight of La*

[3] Vol. III, pages 442-3.

[1] *Purity*, Yale Studies in English, LXI, New Haven, 1920.

Tour Landry, in the original French. This dependence, if proved, would be of importance in dating the poem, as the Knight tells us that he composed his treatise on etiquette in 1371. But the parallels are surely too slight to show that the author of *Purity* was familiar with the Knight's work. The point which Professor Gollancz considers most important is that which concerns line 148: 'Hopez þou I be a harlot þi erigaut to prayse.' This line, he thinks, can only be rightly interpreted in the light of the Knight's anecdote of the young squire who is rebuked for wearing a 'cote hardy' resembling a minstrel's. But it is not at all necessary to assume from the line in *Purity* that 'it is by no means a shabby garment that is referred to, but something ultra-fashionable, or such as to provoke antagonism, at all events a costume likely to win the praise of a low-minded person.' On the contrary, the context, with its references to 'no festival frok, bot fyled with werkkez' (136), 'wedez so fowle' (140), 'so ratted a robe' (144), 'þat goun feble' (145), seem to me absolutely to forbid that the 'erigaut' be thought of here as 'something ultra-fashionable.' I take the line to mean nothing more than: 'Do you expect me to be base enough to praise your cloak?' i. e., 'How can I do otherwise than condemn it?' This is simply one of many lines in expansion of the story of the man without a wedding garment.

Professor Gollancz does not discuss in detail the vexed question of the relative chronology of the poems by the author of *The Pearl,* but that he still clings to Ten Brink's order may be inferred from his incidental remark that '*Patience,* from the artistic standpoint, could hardly have preceded *Cleanness,*' and from a few footnotes in refutation of my arguments for the priority of *Patience.* It is perhaps noteworthy that he does not here repeat the opinion expressed in his preface to *Patience* and elsewhere, that *Gawain* is the earliest of the four poems, an assumption that is extremely improbable.[2]

The division into quatrains, first suggested by Professor Gollancz in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (I, 361), has

[2] See my edition of *Purity,* pp. xxxiii ff. It is interesting to find that in his new edition of *Pearl,* which came into my hands after this review was written, Gollancz definitely retracts his earlier view of the priority of *Gawain,* and is 'at present inclined to the view that a long period intervened between the homiletic poems and the matured excellence of *Gawain*' (p. xxxvi).

been definitely adopted in this edition, as it was in that of *Patience*, in the same series. That the poet frequently grouped his lines in fours is plain, not only from the marginal marks in the manuscript, but from the natural division of lines in *Purity* and *Patience*, as contrasted, for example, with that in *Gawain* or *The Wars of Alexander*. But whether this justifies one in printing the poems in quatrains is a disputable matter. The poet himself did not adhere carefully to this scheme, especially at the end of the poem, where the editor is obliged to assume stanzas of five lines in four cases (1541-5; 1586-90; 1757-61; 1762-6), and stanzas of two lines in two cases (1591-2; 1791-2), in order to retain the quatrain arrangement in other places.[3] It is to Professor Gollancz's credit that he is courageous enough to attribute the confusion to the author, and not to the scribe. That the so-called 'stanzas' are not really units of thought may be easily seen from the editor's punctuation of lines 33 to 48, where commas occur at the end of the quatrains and heavier punctuation within them. Many of the editor's periods at the end of quatrains are factitious, since the lines might often just as easily be read as couplets or in groups of six, and the modern reader who finds the long homily in verse more attractive in this form must remember that the division is frequently one for the outward eye only. In some cases, it is true, the recognition of the tendency to quatrains has resulted in a better punctuation and interpretation of thought; for example, Gollancz's periods after lines 796 and 1020 are probably better than my commas. But, on the other hand, the editor's insistence on the quatrain arrangement has sometimes resulted in what seems to me a misinterpretation of the passage, at line 20, for example, where the period obscures the dependence of the '*nif*'-clause on the *so* of line 17; or at least in an unnatural grouping of the lines, as at lines 388-9, where a semi-colon divides the two clauses beginning with *summe*.[4]

[3] The scribe was not so clever as Professor Gollancz in discovering the precise points at which the poet lapsed from regularity; he continues to insert his marginal marks at 1569, 1573, 1581, 1589, where there can be no division, and again at 1761, 1765, 1769, 1773, 1777, 1781, etc., where perhaps his division is as likely as Professor Gollancz's.

[4] For further discussion of this problem, see *Purity*, pp. xliii ff., where I have perhaps understated the importance of the grouping in four lines, and Emerson, *Modern Language Notes* XXXI, 2-4, on the grouping in *Patience*.

Only in a very few instances does Professor Gollancz read the manuscript differently from previous editors, and these are cases, for the most part, where the original reading has been blurred or altered. I think he is wrong in reading *forletez* instead of *forlotez* (101), *fyltyr* instead of *fylter* (224), *rysod* instead of *rysed* (1203), *loued* instead of *laued* (1703), *enfannined* instead of *enfaminied* (1194), though in the last case the appearance of two strokes instead of one (over the i's) may be due to the rotograph. *ȝisse* (229) cannot be right; the manuscript may be read *þis* or *ȝis*, as the first letter is very indistinct, but there is no room for any other letters before *hit*. On the other hand, Gollancz may be right in seeing a *ȝ* at the end of *stande* (1618), and in reading *halez*, not *houez* (458), where the manuscript is very much blotted.

The many important emendations are a welcome contribution to the interpretation of this most difficult text, and the most valuable part of Gollancz's edition, in spite of the fact that the manuscript has been too frequently tampered with without sufficient reason. Of the emendations proposed for the first time, some should be accepted at once: *feler* for *fele* (177); *skylnade* (ON. *skilnaðr*) for *skynalde* or *skyualde* (329), which solves the mystery of a much-discussed line; *sotyly* for *sothly* (654); *þer* for *þe* (1766). Others range from ingenious changes which are very plausible to mechanical alteration for the sake of grammatical consistency or a smoother reading. Among the plausible emendations I should include *ferkeȝ* for *ferre* (98), *seventeþe* for *sevenþe* (427, translating the Vulgate *septimodecimo*), *bydene* for *by ene* (659), *gounes* for *gomes*[5] (1315), *leue* for *loue* (1419), *þ'ydres* for *þede* (1717). Among the unnecessary grammatical changes is *marred* for MS. *marre*, third plural (279), as a present tense (*bygynnez*) occurs in the next line. Even *myrle*[*d*] (475) and *walle*[*d*] (1390) are hazardous emendations, in view of the possibility that the Northern loss of the final dental is characteristic of the author's dialect.[6] Still more hazardous are the many minor

[5] Emerson (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology* XX, 234) suggests *gemes* (for *gemmes*). Another of Emerson's suggestions, *bame* 'balm, comfort' (*ibid.*, p. 238) for *banne* (620) is proposed independently by Gollancz, whose form *baume* is perhaps preferable. This is undoubtedly the right word.

[6] See Mabel Day, *Modern Language Review* XIV, 413, and Emerson, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* XX, 230.

changes made for the sake of avoiding awkwardness or increasing the smoothness of the line.[7] What can possibly justify the omission of the second *he* in line 1423: 'For he waytez on wyde, his wenches he byholdes'? The metrical scheme of the second half-line is exactly the same as that in the line following—'aboute bi þe woȝes.'

Other emendations, due to fancied difficulties, are equally unnecessary. 'þe moste mountaynez on mor þenne watz no more dryȝe (385), Gollancz alters to 'þe moste mountaynez on mor þenne [on] more dryȝe,' which he interprets 'the highest mountains on the moor then alone were more dry, *i. e.* less submerged than the rest,' the reason for the change being the fact that the next line declares '& þeron flokked þe folke.' But one may easily interpret the line as it stands to mean not that the mountains were completely covered, but simply that the waters of the flood were creeping upon even the highest of them; the floating comparative 'more dryȝe' of the emendation makes more difficulty than the manuscript reading.[8]

In attempting to restore the alliteration by means of emendation, Gollancz has made many needless changes and suggested others, because he failed to take into account the poet's use of double alliteration, especially of the type a a b b, a common characteristic of Middle English alliterative verse, and his practise of permitting an unstressed syllable to take the alliteration.[9] In line 345: '"Now Noe," quoþ oure lorde, "art þou al redy?"' Gollancz suggests *lede* for *al,* and similarly in line 1304: '& Nabugo de Nozar makes much joye,' he suggests *nouthe* for *much;* but the manuscript is justified in each case by the same form of alliteration (a a b b) in line 299: '*S*em *s*oþly þat *o*n, þat *o*þer hyȝt Cam,' and line 1573: 'out-*t*aken bare *t*wo, & *þ*enne he þe *þ*rydde.' In view of these cases, another tempting emendation *leue* to *beue*

[7] Here I should include *vponande* for *vpon* (318); *þat* for *þer* (432); *wyth* for *þat* (594); *I* for *&* (917); *so* inserted after *for* (1057); *hatȝ* for *is* (1143); *hem* inserted after *spylt* (1220); *he* inserted after *hade* (1336); *þer* for *þat* (1532); *he* inserted before *cluchches,* 'bend' (1541); *his* for *þat* (1811).

[8] The following changes are unnecessary for various reasons: *forþerde* for *forferde* (1051); *prystyly* for *pryuyly* (1107); *plit strange* for *plit stronge,* 'great sin' (1494; see *NED.* for both meanings).

[9] K. Schumacher, *Studien über den Stabreim in der me. Alliterationsdichtung* (Bonn, 1914), p. 27.

(1622) is unwise, since the alliteration may be: 'Baltazar vmbebrayde hym, & "Leue sir," he sayde.' Line 745: 'þen Abraham obeched hym & lo3ly him þonkkez,' suffers an extraordinary change at the editor's hands, becoming 'þen [þe burne] obeched hym & [b]o3[som]ly him þonkkez.' But even if '*obeched* is obviously the alliterating word,' as Gollancz says, the alliteration may be on the unstressed *o*, not on the *b*, and by changing *lo3ly* to *he3ly* (compare *Gawain* 773), surely a much less violent emendation, we have a line with regular vowel-alliteration.[10]

Since Professor Gollancz's own suggestions for the emendation of the text are so numerous and so important, it is singularly unfortunate that his editorial method does not permit him to give proper acknowledgment to the many scholars who have preceded him in endeavoring to interpret the difficulties of the text, and to distinguish between those emendations which have been proposed in print by others, and those appearing for the first time in his edition. Aside from some thirty obvious corrections of the manuscript which every editor or commentator has made mechanically, there are fifty-six emendations adopted in the present text which had been previously proposed by other students of the poem. Of these only nineteen are attributed to those who first proposed them in print, and though they may have occurred to the present editor independently, this hardly excuses his failure at least to mention the fact that he has been anticipated.[11]

Similarly, even a desire to avoid controversy and condense as much as possible hardly excuses the careless and misleading way in which Professor Gollancz employs the phrase 'hitherto unexplained.' It is hardly fair, for example, to use the expression in connection with an interpretation of the difficult lines 433-4 which differs somewhat from *four* previously suggested (see my edition).

[10] Vowels of course alliterate freely with *h* before vowels; cf. lines 11, 14.

[11] For example, Morris changed *stystez þat myz* to *stynteȝ þaſ nyȝt* (359); Bateson proposed *forþering* for *forering* (3), and *heryed* for *heyred* (1527); Emerson proposed *bekyr ande bol[l]e* (1474); *sanctorum* [þer] *soþefast* (1491). As my own edition came into Professor Gollancz's hands only after part of his was already in type, he can hardly be blamed for not mentioning the fact that I anticipated him in adopting *heven* for *her even* (50); *so wer* for *sower* (69); *murnande* (I read *mornande*) for *wepande* (778); *þer* for *þen* (926); *nomen* (Emerson, too, proposed *nomon*) for *no mon* (1002); *smelle* for *synne* (1019).

So, after Professor Emerson (and I, independently) had given an explanation of the word *ungoderly* (145), it is disconcerting to find what seems to me an extremely fantastic etymology proposed in this manner: 'This word, hitherto unexplained, seems an Englishing of "boner" (*i. e.* bonaire, a common ME. form for deboner, debonaire) = well-bred, with the negative prefix = "de mal aire," ill-mannered. The *-ly* suffix was due to analogy with "ungodly."' Finally, it should be noted that for *olipraunce* (1349) 'of hitherto unknown origin,' the editor elaborately presents an etymology (the French name Olibrius) proposed as long ago as 1890 by Henry Bradley (*Academy,* January 11).

The notes contain many ingenious and valuable explanations of obscure words and phrases, though the etymologies suggested are sometimes far-fetched. *Jumpred,?* 'confusion' (491) is more likely to be connected with Chaucer's verb *jumpre* (*Troilus* 2. 1037) than with *jumper,* 'boré with a jumper,' a technical meaning which has every appearance of being modern. 'For þat schewe me schale in þo schyre howsez' (553) is paraphrased 'Because it, *i. e.* a speck or spot, is shunned in those radiant mansions,' *schewe* being considered aphetic for *eschewe,* 'avoid.' But this is seeking trouble; *schewe* means 'appear' and taking *me* as 'one,' the line may be translated 'In order that one shall appear,' etc. Gollancz's defense of the manuscript *hokyllen* (1267, I emended to *he kyllen*), as 'hockle, cut down (like grass),' now seems to me right. 'Stepe stayred stones' (1396), usually translated 'brightly gleamed jewels,' cannot mean 'ascended the staired stones,' because 'step' is not used in this sense without a preposition. Gollancz's connection of *umbeþour* (1384) with *umbethourid,* which occurs twice in *The Wars of Alexander* (3857, 4806) is probably correct, though the line is still obscure. I suggest the possibility of putting a comma after *þrowen,* and paraphrasing lines 1383-4 'Pinnacled towers at intervals, the length of twenty spears apart, and (even) more thickly crowded, surrounded by a paling set crosswise.' That *med* (1391) is related to OE. *gemet,* 'measure,' or *mode* (1635) to ON. *mōt,* 'stamp,' or 'mark,' seems to me semantically improbable and phonologically impossible. In several instances Gollancz assumes that final *y* is the equivalent of *e—skyly* (62), *mayny-molde* (514); *clyvy* (1692), which he derives from OE. *clīfe*); but if this is true, it is possibly only a scribal error, as in

each case a *y* is found in the syllable preceding.[12] One of the most ingenious suggestions in the book is *þ'ydres* 'bowls, vessels,' Vulgate *hydria,* for the difficult *þede* (1717). Here, as elsewhere, Gollancz is careful to state precisely how the corruption of the text may have come about.

This review has naturally emphasized the points in which I dissent from Professor Gollancz, but I have not undertaken to discuss the differences, which are many, in the general plan and scope of his edition and my own. In spite of the fact that Professor Gollancz has solved, or at least brought us nearer the solution of, many cruces in *Purity,* fascinating problems of textual interpretation still remain. It is to be hoped that the appearance of two new editions of a poem long unduly neglected will direct attention not only to these problems, but to the importance of *Purity* in its relationship to the other poems of the alliterative school.

Robert J. Menner.

Yale University.

Das dichterische Kunstwerk. Grundbegriffe der Urteilsbildung in der Literaturgeschichte von E. Ermatinger. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner, 1921. viii + 405 pp.

What principles shall guide us in estimating the poet and his work? Such is the main question proposed in this book. As between two prevalent methods, the one historical, objective, and descriptive (tending to formalism), the other subjective and philosophical (tending to caprice), the author believes *in der Mitten liegt holdes Bescheiden.* While the critic should not be dominated by an ideal of abstract verity (unattainable anyway), he must have a sense of responsibility, appealing to his scientific and his social conscience.

The first distinction is between *Welt* and *Ich.* By *Welt* is meant not *Ding an sich* (excluded from the discussion as unknowable), but a sort of *Gesamtich,* a conventionalized ego, formed by tradi-

[12] But Emerson (*Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, xxxvii, 58 f.) cites many examples from this manuscript which seem to show that this representation of final unstressed *e* reflects confusion in the language itself.

tion. The varying conflict between these two forces is termed *Erleben,* and is the source of the poet's dynamic and vital idea, his *Weltanschauung,* which expresses itself in symbolic forms, his particular works. Thus at the outset naturalism and impressionism are condemned on principle, and the creative sovereignty of the poet is asserted.

The interplay of these forces (*Ich,* as feeling, sensation, will; and convention, as understanding, roughly speaking) results in *imagination,* which is a creator of new values. And the intensity of the conflict measures the creative power of any individual. Also the varying participation and energy of these elements in the struggle seem to the author to furnish fundamental distinctions between epic, lyric, and dramatic poets. He too readily finds agreement of certain examples with his theoretical views, and does not avoid the seductive fallacy of reasoning from a particular to a general. Mörike was indeed *passive* (though his writing poetry in bed does not prove it!), but Goethe, greatest of lyric poets, was not. And certainly the author should be more sceptical of his own reasoning than to commit himself to the assertion (p. 25), that, compared with epic poets, dramatists, because of the intenser conflict in them between *Ich* and *Welt, seldom grow old.* Virgil lived to be 51, Dante 56, Racine 60, Aeschylus 69 (and died by accident), Euripides 74, Corneille 78, Ibsen 78, Calderon 81, Grillparzer 81, Sophocles 90. In the same way Keller as calm, cool materialist, is made too exclusively the type of the epic poet. What about Dante? Dostoevsky? Accidental personal qualities are here confounded with the characteristics of *genre.*

More convincing is the discussion of the creative experience (*künstlerisches Erleben*). Philosophy is considered an aid to the poet in finding himself, striking examples being Keller, Kleist, and Hölderlin. Rejecting the milieu theory as impersonal and uncreative, the author affirms the unique and dynamic force of the creative spirit, and proceeds to set up the reach of experience, its intensity, and its degree of faith (as opposed to *Wissen*) as proper tests of genius. Goethe's reach, for example, is large, Storm's narrow. Schiller's dynamic ideas are limited chiefly to the conflict between realism and idealism, and no idea at all is manifest in his later works, from *Maria Stuart* on (p. 116), these plays being condemned as technical feats. (This view, for *Maria*

Stuart, at least, is contradicted by the author on p. 163). Absence of ideas characterizes journalistic and naturalistic writers, who employ a (spurious) principle of organization in certain scientific "truths" not born of their own experience.

The poet's dynamic idea symbolizes itself in material form, whence there must also be a *Stofferlebnis.* Here are considered the sources of material, and the relation of idea to material. Subjects may be invented, or else discovered (in present reality, in tradition, in the works of other poets). Invention is held to be least satisfactory, because the imagination of the individual must be poor compared with that of a people. This point of view leads the author to a pretty sweeping condemnation of modern drama since Hebbel. Of course the subject-matter is nothing in itself but only in relation to the creative mind of the poet. The subject is not "chosen" by the poet, but finds itself by a kind of pre-established harmony with the dynamic idea. In the finished work there is no subject (*Motiv*) distinguishable from idea, or vice versa. Indeed the very mental processes of the poet are symbolic, *sein Anschauen zugleich ein Denken, sein Denken ein Anschauen. . . . Nur der Dichter denkt symbolisch, im Stoff die Idee, mit der Idee den Stoff* (p. 57).

With most of this we can readily agree. The author then proceeds further to characterize epic, lyric, and dramatic poets by means of their *Stofferlebnis.* In the lyric experience everything is inward; there is no conflict, no real use of time and place, which here have only emotional values. In the dramatic material there must be implied a conflict adequate to the poet's ideal dualism, a demand which, needless to say, denies the static drama of naturalism. Epic material is more contemplative; in general it is incident rather than action, *schicksals-,* not *willensbestimmt.* Again the author is inclined to overstate his case. The *Nibelungen* material, for example, is both epic and dramatic, and Hebbel considered the author of the *Nibelungenlied* to be a "dramatist from head to foot." *Crime and Punishment* deals with the same basic problem as *Macbeth.* Nor is dramatic action always *willensbestimmt* (*Oedipus Rex*). It is too easy to attach abstract value to practical distinctions.

About half the book is concerned with *Formerlebnis.* Here the discussion turns on inner and outer form. Inner form seems

at bottom to be the same as *Gedankenerlebnis* (*Weltanschauung, Ideendynamik*). At any rate it is just this spiritual trend of the poet active in a particular work. It shows itself in three ways: as a peculiar atmosphere, as inner motivation, and as symbolic meaning. Under the first of these divisions are managed unobtrusively such difficult categories as comedy, tragedy, humor, the interesting section on tragedy resting firmly on Hegel. Inner motivation is unity of perspective, exemplified in detail by *Der Prinz von Homburg*. Particularly interesting is the explanation of rhythm in lyric poetry as a manifestation of this inner motivation. Perhaps the most important question asked in connection with inner form is, how we are to estimate the moral judgments approved by the poet in his work. In answer the author denies first the existence of any truth in an absolute sense in poetry (p. 270). But he definitely restricts this statement by taking refuge with Hegel's distinction between temporal moral conceptions and *Vernunft als sittliche Gesetzmässigkeit der Welt*. He finds that the history of literature confirms the philosopher, and that there are recognizable certain *letzte und allgemeinste Sittenbegriffe* common to all great poets. Some of these are specified: Sanctity of life, Truth, Love, Fidelity, Reverence (p. 272).

All the elements implicit in inner form affect the outer form, or style. The determining quality of outer form, compared with inner, is the "effect," or the consideration of the public. *Künstlerisch formen heisst letzten Endes die Gesichte des Innern in äussere Bildhaftigkeit wandeln, Unsichtbares sichtbar allen Blicken ausstellen* (p. 308). However carefully the author guards against any artificial conception of style, the sentence quoted illustrates the difficulty of making a clear distinction between inner and outer form, between *Gesichte des Innern* and *äussere Bildhaftigkeit*. In what sense can the most inner *vision* be *invisible?* The idea that the external situation (public) determines outer form is made the basis for distinguishing style in epic, lyric, and dramatic poetry. Here again some doubtful assertions are made. For example, the proposition that the lyric poet, more than the epic or the dramatic poet, strives for a clear, firm outer form (p. 314) is unprovable, if not meaningless. How valid also is the demand that the language of lyric poetry should avoid "jede Individualisierung durch bestimmte Beiwörter?" A few favorable examples are quoted to

show that lyric poetry *can* be written without such adjectives, and one poem of Arno Holz is held to prove the obverse. The poem, however, is bad for other reasons, and it would be very easy to cite good lyrics with *bestimmte Beiwörter.* Another overstatement of the truth is asserting that the language of lyric poetry is *Präsens und nur das Präsens.* It is generally, but not always: "Ich *ging* im Walde," "Es *schlug* mein Herz," "Ich *sah* des Sommers letzte Rose stehn."

In his characterization of epic style the author lays emphasis on the easygoing tempo, and the fullness of detail in the classical models, contrasted with the quicker movement of modern realism. His position is conservative. In the tendency to make the persons in the story represent themselves (as in drama) he sees the dissolution of epic form. True epic style is held to be a fine balance between *Bericht* and *Darstellung.* This section closes with an interesting discussion of language and rhythm in epic prose.

Style, or outer form, in the drama is determined by the fact that drama is intense conflict of opposing forces. "Static" drama is none. There must be action, and the action must be progressive, without a lapse. A concise and instructive comparison is given between the two types of action: *fortschreitende Handlung* and *rückgreifende Handlung.* A true explanation of the function of the latter, however, it seems to me is not advanced. The *rückgreifende Handlung* (as in *Ghosts,* for example) is employed in modern drama to solve the problem of combining character evolution with practicable unity of time and place, and it originated with Hebbel.[1] Needless to repeat, there is in the author's dramaturgy no room for the drama of naturalism, which he condemns for essentially the same reason as Bartels, Bytkowski, and others. The extent of his conservatism (or is it proper now to call it radicalism?) is seen in his defence of the monologue.

A refreshing feature of this treatise is its stout defense of the autonomy of literature. Psychology, not to mention psychiatry, is not considered the right key to the store-house of literary genius, while the classification of poets according to the subject matter, or even the philosophy of their works, is held to be extraneous to a true science of literature.

[1] Proof of this statement I hope to furnish elsewhere.

This book is derived by thorough scholarship from the best classical and realistic traditions of German literature. It will be helpful to the critic who reads it critically, and does not follow the author into such extremes as condemning poets he does not like by his system (Heine, and Hauptmann, works like *Der Ketzer von Soana* and *Der Narr in Christo* being implicitly at least classified as naturalistic). The reviewer regrets that space is lacking in which to point out its solid qualities more fully, and at the same time better to qualify his own occasional objections.

T. M. Campbell.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy with Special Reference to the Liturgic Drama. By Neil C. Brooks. [University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. vii, No. 2.] Urbana, 1921. 110 pp.

This study, as its title suggests, contains material of interest both to students of Christian archeology and to students of the liturgical plays. The author states, however, that it is an outgrowth of his own interest in the latter field and "is to be viewed primarily as an attempt to enlarge our knowledge of the *mise en scène* of the liturgical Easter plays" (p. 8). It thus supplements Professor Karl Young's discussion of *The Dramatic Associations of the Easter Sepulchre* (Madison, 1920) where there is no detailed consideration of the sepulchre itself, and investigates a subject much less exhaustively treated in Dr. J. K. Bonnell's article on *The Easter Sepulchrum in its Relation to the Architecture of the High Altar* (*PMLA.* xxxi, 1916, pp. 664 ff.).

Professor Brooks begins at the beginning—with such accounts of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem as have survived. He shows that the sixth and seventh century representations of the tomb of Christ in Syro-Palestinian art strikingly agree with the descriptions of early pilgrims and probably portray the Holy Sepulchre as it was in the time of Constantine, that is, a quadrangular structure completed by a sort of ciborium. In the medieval Byzantine representations, on the other hand, the tomb is variously portrayed

as hewn in a rock, as a sarcophagus before an opening into a rock, a sarcophagus surmounted by a ciborium, a sarcophagus alone, or a sort of square sentry-box.

In the West, although the influence of Byzantium made itself felt during the early middle ages, representations of the tomb in art developed independent types. During the late fourth and the fifth centuries the sepulchre is pictured as a cylindrical tower with cupola-shaped or conical roof. This simple tower-like type of structure is later replaced by a more elaborate sort of temple, an edifice of two or more stories, the lowest usually square in shape, the upper round. In the course of the eleventh century, however, the representation of the sepulchre as an edifice or as placed within an edifice begins to disappear, and the tomb is portrayed as a sarcophagus without architectural accessories. How far this Western coffer-tomb type developed as a result of Byzantine influence, Professor Brooks finds it difficult to say, but he thinks it possible (p. 25) that the religious drama may not have been without influence upon it.[1]

At this point one naturally expects a discussion of the connection between the representations of the sepulchre in art and the Easter sepulchre used in the liturgical ceremonies. Instead the author pauses to consider (pp. 26-9) Dr. Bonnell's theory of the relations existing between the sepulchre in art and the high altar. He plausibly concludes that the Occidental representations of the tomb of Christ were not influenced by the architecture of the high altar and later (p. 85) he also rejects Dr. Bonnell's hypothesis that the Easter sepulchre of the liturgy "was reminiscent, if not directly an imitation, of the early form of canopied altar." Beyond a suggestion, however, that the coffer-shaped sepulchre recalls the sarcophagus used in Christian iconography from the eleventh century on (p. 62), Professor Brooks makes no attempt to connect the

[1] A fuller discussion of this point would have been welcome. Meyer's theory that the drama influenced representations of the Resurrection scene in art is mentioned, but Mâle's article in the *Revue de l'art ancien et moderne*, 1907 and his book, *L'Art religieux de la fin du moyen âge*, Paris 1908, which show the influence of the drama in the iconography of other scenes, are not cited. Following Meyer, Professor Brooks states (p. 13) that the actual moment of the Resurrection was not depicted before the latter part of the twelfth century. Mâle in *L'Art religieux du XIIIe s. en France* (3rd ed. 1910, p. 231) refers to an example of the eleventh century.

representation of the tomb of Christ in art with the Easter sepulchre, and in general avoids the question of "origins" altogether, unless his opinion that "the English Easter sepulchre developed very largely in imitation of the church burial of persons of rank" (p. 85) can be so interpreted. On the other hand, his classification and description of the various types of sepulchres used in continental and English churches,[2] his distinction between permanent and temporary sepulchres, his investigation of the location of the sepulchre in the different European countries in which it was employed, and his array of material from archival sources regarding its setting up, its contents, its lights, etc. add immeasurably to our knowledge of the *mise en scène* of the liturgical ceremonies.

These ceremonies are considered in detail in chapter V. Professor Brooks accepts the theory advanced by Professor Young that the extra-liturgical *Depositio Crucis* was influenced by the liturgical *Adoratio Crucis* of Good Friday. That, however, the reservation of the Host consecrated on Holy Thursday for the Missa Praesanctificatorum of Good Friday also exerted some influence upon the rise of the *Depositio* seems to him less probable. He notes that there was little special pomp in early times connected with the reservation of the presanctified Host (pp. 33, 50), that texts indicating the burial of the Host alone on Good Friday are relatively uncommon before the sixteenth century (p. 40), and that the term "sepulchre" was never specifically given to the *reposoir* in any place where the "true" sepulchre was set up on Friday, though it came into use in this connection after the disappearance of the true sepulchre (p. 50). He also shows that the Host, the symbol of the living Christ, was apparently considered more suitable for use in the *Elevatio* than in the *Depositio,* and he infers that in some cases where the Host was featured in the *Elevatio* but not in the corresponding *Depositio* it may have been placed in the sepulchre on Easter morning just before the *Elevatio.*

It is nevertheless true that the Host does appear in these ceremonies, that it appears alone and early, and that it appears very

[2] It is unfortunate that one must still consult Bonnell's summaries (pp. 667-81), based on the Easter plays alone, for an estimate of the relative frequency of the various types. An estimate based on the much more extensive data accessible to Professor Brooks would have been most useful.

frequently together with the Cross. How then account for its presence? Professor Brooks, while not accepting Professor Young's suggestion, offers none of his own. It would seem possible to me, however, to reconcile both the facts and our authorities by assuming that the *Depositio Crucis* arose in connection with the *Adoratio Crucis,* and that the use of the Host in place of the Cross or together with it is to be regarded as a somewhat later development, influenced where it occurs by the reservation of the presanctified Host.[3]

A classified list of the texts available for the study of the *Depositio* and *Elevatio* (pp. 33-6), a number of interesting conclusions based upon the grouping of these texts according to their provenience, a discussion of the meaning of the *Imago crucifixi* mentioned in some of them, an investigation of the liturgical positions of these ceremonies, a description of the Exposition rite still tolerated in Germany and Austria, an important distinction between the true sepulchre and the place of repose, and an Appendix containing a number of new or little known texts, these are only a few of the other valuable and suggestive contributions to the subject contained in this study. A special word of gratitude is due for the well-chosen illustrations that accompany it.

GRACE FRANK.

Baltimore.

French Conversation and Composition. By HARRY VINCENT WANN. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1920. 202 pp.

The aim of the work is, in the author's own words, to provide material for conversation and for grammatical review. Nothing new is offered in method, yet this is precisely what one should like to see in some of the many books coming yearly from the

[3] The absence of special pomp in connection with the reservation of the Host does not seem to me to preclude the probability that the act of placing the Corpus Domini in the *reposoir* on Holy Thursday may have suggested to some the idea of burial which was essentially appropriate to Good Friday, especially in view of the fact that at all periods of liturgical history the receptacle for reserving the Eucharist was symbolized as a tomb (Young, p. 15). Indeed, the Host for the *Depositio* was sometimes consecrated at the same time as the Host for the Mass of Good Friday (Young, p. 17, note 34).

press in ever increasing numbers. As language is one of the means man has of reacting to living situations, of expressing his opinion concerning them, the chief aim of a book of this sort should be to recreate these situations, for they are largely absent in the conditions under which the teacher works. Grammar should be minimized. Ready-made questions are of little use, for they seem artificial to the teacher and are usually replaced by queries of his own. In view of these considerations the minor value of the present work is quite evident.

In addition to the questions on carefully selected texts and to the English-French sentence exercises, the author has introduced six exercises on equivalents, one "unfinished sentence exercise," four "definition exercises" and one "idées contraires" exercise. It is difficult to determine the aim which he proposes to reach by the use of the latter, or what is their place in the general plan of his book.

The vocabulary is entirely in French, a novel, and rather laudable feature, in view of the character and aim of the work. Most of the definitions, as the author avows in the preface, are taken from *Le Petit Larousse* and *Hatzfeld et Darmesteter*. Wherever Mr. Wann takes the definition bodily, he does well, but here and there he endeavors to abridge it, with resultant inaccuracies. Thus, for instance, p. 196, "tableau" is defined as "ouvrage de peinture exécuté sur toile." *Le Petit Larousse* has the same definition, but adds "sur toile, bois, etc." Mr. Wann's definition will prove misleading for the average student. P. 17, "Il chanta la Marseillaise (literary)." I presume that if the French of the Midi were told this, they would exclaim in M. Jourdain's fashion that they have been talking literary French all their lives, and haven't known it. P. 149, "Détail—Action de diviser en morceaux circonstance." This definition is inaccurate, since, when we speak of detail, we think of the result rather than of the process or action that brings it about. P. 152, One definition of *écume* is "bave de certains animaux échauffés ou en colère." Since *bave* is not defined anywhere in the vocabulary and since the word is rather unusual for beginners, the definition is useless. P. 196, "Sumac—sorte de plante." The definition would do for any plant. P. 198, "Traduction—Interprétation." The two words are not equivalent in meaning. P. 199, "Trille—Terme de Musique: manière de chanter une note."

But what kind of "manière de chanter"? The answer to this question would furnish the definition of the word. P. 200, "Vasistas—Petite partie mobile d'une porte ou d'une fenêtre." Again the definition says nothing. *Le Petit Larousse* gives the same, but the picture opposite it makes the definition clear.

If Mr. Wann's work proves of value and a second edition is contemplated, a revision of the vocabulary would seem most urgent. Surely an English-French vocabulary, totally missing now, would prove valuable to the student in the English-French translations and would make the work, for certain purposes, more usable.

George Getchev.

Syracuse University.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Dance of Death in Shakespeare

In *The Dance of Death* of Francis Douce the following statement is made: "From a manuscript note by John Stowe in his copy of Leland's *Itinerary,* it appears that there was a Dance of Death in the church of Stratford upon Avon: and the conjecture that Shakespeare in a passage in *Measure for Measure* might have remembered it, will not, perhaps, be deemed very extravagant. He there alludes to Death and the fool, a subject always introduced into the paintings in question."[1] This is misleading, for it was not the collegiate church of the Holy Trinity to which Stow's note had reference, but the affiliated chapel of the Trinity, belonging to the Guild of the Holy Cross. Moreover, Shakespeare could scarcely have remembered the paintings under discussion since they had ceased to exist a century before his birth.

The passage from Leland, with Stow's note, reads: "There is a right goodly chappell in a faire streate toward the southe ende of the towne dedicate to the Trinitie. This chapell was newly reedified in mind of man by one Hughe Clopton, Major of London. About the body of this chaple was curiously paynted the Daunce of Deathe commonly called the Daunce of Powles, becawse the same was sometyme there paynted abowte the cloysters on the northwest syd of Powles churche, pulled downe by the Duke of Somarset, tempore E. 6."[2]

[1] Douce: *The Dance of Death exhibited in elegant engravings on wood . . . .* p. 53.

[2] Leland: *Itinerary,* ed. by L. T. Smith, vol. II, Part v, p. 49. About—E. 6. is Stow's note.

In 1804 Thomas Fisher made accurate reproductions of paintings and frescoes on the walls of the chapel of the Trinity,[3] just brought to light after years of whitewash and oblivion. Fisher records paintings in the nave and chancel, but not one which is suggestive of the Dance of Death. Stow's note undoubtedly refers to paintings ante-dating those which Fisher preserves; destroyed at the time Sir Hugh Clopton "reedified" the chapel; and therefore preceding Shakespeare by over one hundred years.

Such was the popularity of the macabre epic, however, even in the Elizabethan period, that it is not at all improbable that Shakespeare was familiar with the Dance of Death and that this familiarity can be seen in his work.

The passage from *Measure for Measure* reads:

> Merely, thou art Death's fool;
> For him thou labour'st by thy flight to shun
> And yet runn'st toward him still.[4]

The following passage from *Richard II* is quoted in the introduction to Smith's edition of Holbein's *Dance of Death*. It would seem to recall the cut of "Death and the Emperor."

> for within the hollow crown
> That rounds the mortal temples of a king
> Keeps Death his court, and there the antic sits,
> Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp,
> Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
> To monarchize, be fear'd, and kill with looks,
> Infusing him with self and vain conceit,
> As if this flesh which walls about our life
> Were brass impregnable; and humour'd thus
> Comes at the last and with a little pin
> Bores through his castle wall, and—farewell king![5]

These quotations are merely suggestive of the Dance. Far more clearly its influence is felt in the opening of the first scene of the fifth act of *Hamlet*. Here we find not only a list, after the manner of the Dance, but the very structure is reminiscent, Hamlet playing the part of the "Auctor" who points the melancholy moral to the "Lector," Horatio.

We have first the Politician. "It might be the pate of a politician, which this ass now o'erreaches; one that would circumvent God, might it not?"

Then the Courtier: "Or of a courtier, which could say, 'Good morrow, sweet lord! How dost thou, good lord?' This might be

[3] Fisher: *Ancient, Allegorical, Historical and Legendary Paintings in Fresco Discovered in the Summer of 1804 on the walls of the Chapel of the Trinity at Stratford upon Avon.*

[4] *Measure for Measure*, III, ii

[5] *Richard II*, III, ii. Quoted in Smith: *Holbein's Dance of Death*, p. 39.

my lord such-a-one, that prais'd my lord such-a-one's horse, when he meant to beg it . . . . and now my Lady Worm's; chapless and knock'd about the mazzard with a sexton's spade. Here's fine revolution, if we had the trick to see't."

With the mention of the Lawyer and the Rich Man the tone becomes unmistakably macabre. "Why might not that be the skull of a lawyer? Where be his quiddits now, his quillets, his cases, his tenures, and his tricks? Why does he suffer this rude knave now to knock him about the sconce with a dirty shovel, and will not tell him of his action of battery? Hum! This fellow might be in's time a great buyer of land, with his statutes, his recognizes, his fines, his double vouchers, his recoveries. Is this the fine of his fines, and the recovery of his recoveries, to have his fine pate full of fine dirt? Will his vouchers vouch him no more of his purchases, and double ones too, than the length and breadth of a pair of indentures? The very conveyances of his lands will hardly lie in this box, and must the inheritor himself have no more, ha?"

Ophelia and Yorick complete the list, Ophelia corresponding to the Gentlewoman of the old Dance, and Yorick to the Fool. As the "inheritor" was mentioned in Hamlet's remarks on the buyer of land, so the "lady" appears in his lament for Yorick. "Here hung those lips that I have kiss'd I know not how oft. Where be your gibes now, your gambols, your songs, your flashes of merriment, that were wont to set the table on a roar? Not one now, to mock your own grinning? Quite chop-fallen? Now get you to my lady's chamber, and tell her, let her paint an inch thick, to this favour she must come. Make her laugh at that."

To sum up, we have in scene i, act V of *Hamlet* the following stock characters of the Dance of Death: the Auctor, the Lector, the Gentlewoman, the Politician, the Courtier, the Lawyer, the Rich Man, the Heir, the Lady, and the Fool.

MARGARET MILNE BECK.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Julius Caesar II, i, 10-34

The soliloquy of Brutus at the beginning of the second act of *Julius Caesar,* in which Caesar is compared to a serpent still in the egg, may be a further indication that Shakespeare is following some sixteenth century Latin play, now lost. The phrase "Et tu, Brute," in the following act, not found in any of the historical accounts of the assassination, has often been thought to suggest such an origin. Professor Ayres has, further, shown that Shakespeare's conception of the character of Caesar is not that of the historians, but rather that of the sixteenth century writers of tragedies on this then popular theme.

The soliloquy of Brutus referred to has seemed rather flat to most critics. Coleridge, for example, calls it singular; Hudson speaks of Brutus' "giddiness of the head"; Hodge calls it a "sophistic device." But it must be noted that the soliloquy would in Latin have much more point, from a play on the word *regulus,* appearing in Shakespeare's play as "adder."

The meaning of the words "brings forth the adder" is, of course, "hatches the adder from its shell"; this is proved by the last lines of the passage:

> And therefore, think him as a serpent's egg
> Which, hatch'd, would, as his kind, grow mischievous,
> And kill him in the shell.

Adder is the common translation for the Latin *regulus,* the crowned serpent, often called basilisk or cockatrice. In the Vulgate, *Proverbs* 23, 32 appears thus: *Mordebit ut coluber, et sicut regulus venena diffundet.* The King James version here translates *regulus* as *adder,* with the marginal gloss: "Or a cockatrice."[1]

The stories of the birth of the cockatrice or *regulus* from the egg of a cock, and of the deadly power of its mere glance, are familiar enough; it, if any serpent, would "crave wary walking." Lemnius in his *De occultis Miraculis Naturæ* (ed. 1598), Bk. iv, ch. 12, gives this account: "Ubi vero decrepitus [gallus] esse incipit, ac senectute confici, quod nonnullis septimo, nono, aut ad summum decimo-quarto euenit, pro virium vel robore vel imbecillitate, aut etiam concumbendi assuetudine, qua nulli non animantium naturæ vis deiicitur atque eneruatur, ouum profert æstiuis mensibus, ac Caniculæ sideris exortu, ex putrefacto, opinor, seminis excremento, aut humorum colluuie conflatum, forma non oblonga, vel ouali, vt gallinis assolet, sed rotunda atque orbiculata, colore modo luteo, buxeo, flauescenti, versicolore, lurido, ex quo produci basiliscum, Latine regulum, nonnulli opinantur, venenatam bestiam, sesquipedali magnitudine, triplici frontis apice, tanquam regio diademate insignitam, erecto infestoque corpore, atque oculis vibrantibus, quibus obuios halitus contagione conficit." In this passage the *æstivis mensibus* corresponds to Shakespeare's "bright day," and *produci* to his "brings forth."

The whole point of the soliloquy, however, is to be found in the double meaning of the word *regulus,* and this point is lost altogether in translating it "adder"; in its original meaning, as a diminutive of *rex,* it would be the natural, somewhat contemptuous term for Brutus to use of Caesar as a would-be king, an unhatched kinglet. This play on the two meanings of *regulus* is quite in keeping with the character of Brutus as he is portrayed in the tragedy, and is of a sort to appeal to any sixteenth century

[1] I do not mean that the English word *adder* always meant *basilisk;* but only that *adder* was the common translation of *regulus* or *basiliscus.*

writer of Latin plays; it would furnish excuse enough for the whole passage. That Shakespeare noted it and kept it in mind is confirmed by the reference in *Hamlet* (a play in which many passages have a striking similarity to passages in *Julius Caesar,* probably its immediate predecessor) to King Claudius as a crowned serpent:

> The serpent that did sting thy father's life
> Now wears his crown.

Here, as in *Julius Caesar,* Shakespeare is evidently thinking of the *regulus* with its poisonous qualities as a suitable comparison for a king newly and wrongfully come to power. It is very noteworthy that he was also still thinking of Latin plays on the subject of Julius Caesar, as produced at the universities; this is shown by Polonius' remark:

> "I did enact Julius Caesar. I was kill'd i' the Capitol;
> Brutus killed me."

The basis of Brutus' whole soliloquy is thus a play on the word *regulus.* As Shakespeare in paraphrasing it in English could not find any word combining the two meanings of *regulus,* the whole passage loses most of its point and thus seems rather flat.

John D. Rea.

Indiana University.

"Looking Under the Sun"

Professor C. Alphonso Smith's extremely interesting discussion (*Mod. Lang. Notes,* xxxvii, 120 f.) of the phrase *under the sonne he loketh* found in Chaucer's *Knightes Tale* 839 and in certain modern ballads puts one in mind of an early instance of a very similar expression. In the Old English poem of *The Phoenix* we are told that the wondrous bird, who is waiting for the sun to rise at the edge of the water,—

> *under lyft ofer lagu lōcaŏ georne . . .* (line 101).

A literal, though of course very awkward, rendering of this line would be: 'he looks in the direction of (the space) under the sky (and) over the water.' For the meaning of *lyft,* see, e. g., *Elene* 1270 f.: *feoh āghwām biŏ / lāne under lyfte;* cp. *under heofenum, roderum, swegle, wolcnum, tunglum, sunnan.* If the phoenix had been watching for some object in broad daylight, the poet might well have said *under sunnan* (accusative) instead of *under lyft lōcaŏ.*

The construction is thoroughly in accord with Germanic syntactical conceptions. Suffice it to mention *Heliand* 655 f: *than sāhun sie sō wīslīko undar thana wolknes skion / up te them hōhen*

himile, hwō fōrun thea hwīton sterron, and, as a suggestive counterpart, *Elene* 87 ff.: *ūp lōcade . . . geseah hē . . . wuldres trēo ofer wolcna hrōf / golde ge[g]lenged.*

As to the expression *under sunnan,* its occurrence in the *Metres of Boethius* 14. 7 may be noted: *ðēah þēs middangeard ond þis manna cyn / sȳ under sunnan* (dative) *sūð, west, ond ēast / his anwalde eall underðīeded.*

Fr. Klaeber.

The University of Minnesota.

"Under the Sonne"

Professor C. Alphonso Smith offers a tempting explanation (*Mod. Lang. Notes,* xxxvii, 120-1) of a passage in Chaucer's *Knight's Tale,* A, 1696-8:

> whan this duc was come unto the launde
> Under the sonne he looketh, and anon
> He was war of Arcite and Palamon.

He believes that "under the sun" means "all around, turning from one point of the compass to the other," and in support quotes from several modern American versions of certain ballads. But it is very doubtful if the phrases in Chaucer and the second ballad are connected in history or meaning. The points of the compass, and the "all," which make the meaning clear in the ballad, are lacking in the Chaucerian passage. "All under the sun," being clearer than "under the sun," should be the earlier and not the later form. "Under the sun" and like phrases are common in Anglo-Saxon and especially in the Bible ("sub sole" occurs dozens of times in *Ecclesiastes*), and mean simply "on earth." This does not fit the *Knight's Tale* passage, so we may do well to consider another interpretation, not a poetic but a literal and perhaps colloquial one, which will show why the phrase apparently does not occur before Chaucer. As Theseus came out of the dark wood into the sunny glade, he peered in the direction of the early-morning sun, shading his eyes with his hand perhaps, a picturesque figure which has always seemed to some readers what Chaucer meant to sketch. This explanation seems quite as well as Dr. Smith's to fit the first ballad passage which he quotes.

John S. P. Tatlock.

Stanford University.

A Portmanteau Word of 1761: "Tomax"

In the sixth chapter of *Through the Looking-Glass,* Alice meets Humpty Dumpty, and asks him to explain the meaning of the poem called "Jabberwocky." Everyone remembers the "hard

words" elucidated: *brillig,* four o'clock in the afternoon, "the time when you begin *broiling* things for dinner; *slithy,* which means 'lithe and slimy.' 'Lithe' is the same as 'active.' You see [said Humpty Dumpty] it's like a portmanteau—there are two meanings packed up into one word."

If Lewis Carroll was the inventor of the term, he was not the inventor of the thing. My colleague, Professor Paul R. Lieder, has called my attention to a portmanteau word dating from 1761. In that year was published at Boston a collection of gratulatory verses presented by the President and Fellows of Harvard College to the new King, George III; this volume is entitled: "Pietas et Gratulatio Collegii Cantabrigiensis apud Novanglos. Bostoni-Massachusettensium. Typis J. Green & J. Russell. MDCCLXI." It includes verses in Greek, Latin, and English, written by various Harvard worthies, but no signatures were affixed to the contributions; the introduction itself bears simply the phrase

> We are, with all humility,
> May it please your MAJESTY,
> Your MAJESTY'S most loyal
> And most dutiful Subjects,
> The President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Two copies of this volume are to be found in the Harvard Library, and one copy is in the Boston Public Library. Both of the Harvard copies were acquired after the fire which destroyed the library in Harvard Hall in 1764, and neither is the first imprint of the first edition. Professor Lieder owns a copy (without the list of *errata* printed in the Harvard copies) which he found in a bookshop on Cape Cod; it contains readings later amended.

In one of the Harvard copies, the title-page of which is inscribed "Samuel Eliot 1761," may be found a note from Professor Norton, dated 31 January, 1879, to Justin Winsor, Librarian of the University, 1877-1897. It reads:

> Dear Mr. Winsor:
>
> I have little doubt that the name of the person who gave the 'Pietas et Gratulatio' to S. Eliot was Lowell,—not Sewell [*sic*].
>
> Mr. Eliot and the Lowells, father and son, were friends for many years.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> C. E. NORTON.

The pamphlet was bound with others, the gift of Samuel A. Eliot in 1845; the second copy came to the Harvard Library in 1853.

There was no member of the Harvard Class of 1761 named Eliot, so the date after his name is evidently that of his acquisition of the book. His copy is filled with MS. notes of interest, only one of which need detain us here.

The eleventh contribution (beginning on page 31 of the pamphlet, and extending to page 41, inclusive) is written in the iambic pentameter couplet characteristic of the eighteenth century. The fulsome compliments to the sovereign we may pass over, pausing at one verse (on page 35) which reads

> Here he restrain'd the Indian's thirst of gore,
> And bid the murd'rous tomax drink no more;

Among the MS. notes of Mr. Eliot is a footnote on this page 35 to "tomax." The word is, he observes, "compounded of Tomahawk and ax." It is a portmanteau word, which must have been as clear to the average reader in the England of 1761—as clear to George III himself—as *brillig* or *slithy* would have been to us, had not Humpty Dumpty kindly explained them.

ROBERT WITHINGTON.

Smith College.

HENRY MORE'S *Psychozoia*

Miss Marjorie H. Nicolson, in her article on Henry More's *Psychozoia* in the March issue of *Modern Language Notes,* states that this poem was first published in 1648. After the first publication of his "Platonick Song of the Soul," of which *Psychozoia* forms the first part, More revised and enlarged his book. He 'licked' the poems, as he fondly thought, "into some more tolerable form and smoothnesse," and published the result under the general title, *Philosophicall Poems.* This is the book to which Miss Nicolson refers in her statement above mentioned; but this was the second edition of *Psychozoia,* and it was published in 1647, not 1648. The first edition was published under the general title, *Psychozoia Platonica: or a Platonicall Song of the Soul,* in 1642.

ROBERT SHAFER.

Wells College.

BRIEF MENTION

Language: its Nature, Development, and Origin. By Otto Jespersen (London, George Allen & Unwin, 1922. 448 pp.). Many a thoughtful reader will probably be surprised at the order in which the divisions of the subject are arranged in the sub-title of this treatise, because his sense of logical sequence would require 'Origin' to be placed first. To discover that Dr. Jespersen has in this been strictly logical is to discover the most distinctive feature of his linguistic speculation, for which one turns at once to page 418. That important page is preceded by paragraphs in which the *a priori* methods of reasoning about the origin of speech

(resulting in the *bow-wow,* the *pooh-pooh,* the *ding-dong* and other theories) are shown to be inadequate. These theories have been based on the untenable assumption of "a speechless mankind" and have yielded the most meagre results. What may be conjectured concerning the origin of language must, however, be disclosed by reversing the direction of the investigator's path. He must not move forward from the assumed speechless man, but backward from the developed into the most undeveloped state of linguistic phenomena, and from what is thus verifiable he must infer the still less and ultimately the least developed state of primitive expression. The basis of this method of reasoning must be the investigation of "(1) the language of children; (2) the language of primitive races; and (3) the history of languages." The discussion of these topics must, therefore, logically precede the discussion of the last topic, "the origin of speech."

The author's description and defense of the adopted method, stated to be employed now for the first time "consistently," may here be quoted in part. It is "to trace our modern twentieth-century languages as far back in time as history and our materials will allow us; and then, from this comparison of present English with Old English, of Danish with Old Norse, and of both with 'Common Gothonic,' of French and Italian with Latin, of modern Indian dialects with Sanskrit, etc., to deduce definite laws for the development of languages in general, and to try and [*read* to] find a system of lines which can be lengthened backwards beyond the reach of history. If we should succeed in discovering certain qualities to be generally typical of the earlier as opposed to the later stages of languages, we shall be justified in concluding that the same qualities obtained in a still higher degree in the earliest times of all." If, by this projection into prehistoric conditions, into the childhood of mankind, "we arrive finally at uttered sounds of such a description that they can no longer be called a real language, but something antecedent to language—why, then the problem will have been solved; for transformation is something we can understand, while a creation out of nothing can never be comprehended by human understanding."

The method described is, therefore, not to solve in its ultimate form the question of the origin of language, but it is to lead to inferences of characteristics of the first semblances of 'real language.' What inferences does Dr. Jespersen offer for consideration?

As to speech-sounds, it is argued backward from the clarifying and simplifying effects of 'advancing civilization' that primitive languages must have been rich in difficult not neatly articulated sounds, making long, unanalyzed words, which were uttered with little restraint of passion and therefore with excessive ranges of pitch, as in song. On the side of grammar, there was entanglement and unanalyzed complications. "Primitive linguistic units," to

take the next step in the investigation, "must have been much more complicated in point of meaning, as well as much longer in point of sound, than those with which we are most familiar"; there was great lack of distinction between word and sentence. And irregularities or anomalies, from the cultivated point of view, as in the series *bonus, melior, optimus,* typify the psychology and the unsystematic habit of the primitive mind, which was lexical rather than grammatically logical. These inferences are then confirmed by the evidence of the languages of savage tribes, and the summarized result is emphasized: "The evolution of language shows a progressive tendency from inseparable, irregular conglomerations to freely and regularly combinable short elements" (p. 429). The vocabulary of simple tribes is enormously increased because of separately naming instead of classifying concrete and related objects, and because of containing no words for the expression of abstract ideas. Now, this concreteness, it is held, establishes "a close relationship between primitive words and poetry." The primitive man "was forced to express his thoughts in the language of poetry," in metaphor or by allegory: poetry precedes prose. The author is especially emphatic in opposing the judgment of Madvig and Whitney, who assumed the communication of thought to be the primary impulse of language. On the contrary, "the genesis of language is . . . in the poetic side of life"; in craving for expression, emotions and instincts preceded thought. Love made a primary demand for expression, and love-songs belong to the effective instrumentalities "in bringing about human language" (p. 484). A foot-note at this point reminds the reader that this view of primitive love-songs is reproduced from the author's *Progress in Language,* 1894, (a book that is now out of print and is now superseded by the present volume), and that the criticism it has elicited is refuted by a just consideration of his inductively obtained basis for reasoning backward toward the earliest impulses and forms of expression.

The subject is continued by taking a wider view of "Primitive Singing" (p. 434 f.) to embrace all the emotional occasions of song, which, in varying measure, is inarticulate in primitive, and in savage, and in peasant-life. The inference is that "men sang out their feelings long before they were able to speak their thoughts. . . . Our remote ancestors had not the slightest notion that such a thing as communicating ideas and feelings to someone else was possible. They little suspected that in singing as nature prompted them they were paving the way for a language capable of rendering minute shades of thought." The next question discussed is thus stated: "How did that which originally was a jingle of meaningless sounds come to be an instrument of thought?" And how was 'the sentence' evolved? The conclusion of the whole matter is this: "Language, then, began with half-musical

unanalyzed expressions for individual beings [concrete words, specialized in meaning, notably proper names; see p. 438] and solitary events. Languages composed of, and evolved from, such words and quasi-sentences are clumsy and insufficient instruments of thought, being intricate, capricious and difficult. But from the beginning the tendency has been one of progress, slow and fitful progress, but still progress towards greater and greater clearness, regularity, ease and pliancy." Of course, no language has yet attained perfection.

Dr. Jespersen has, of course, not definitely determined the beginnings of language, but he has reasoned about the subject in a keen and masterful manner, and the inferences he has drawn from linguistic data put the question—which can never be completely solved—on a fruitful basis for further speculation.

This treatise consists of "Book I, History of Linguistic Science"; "Book II, The Child"; "Book III, The Individual and the World"; "Book IV, Development of Language." Of the last 'Book' (pp. 305-442), the chapter on the origin of speech occupies less than one-fourth of the pages (pp. 412-442); but in extenuation of the charge of having given in this notice a disproportionate account of this chapter it is to be kept in mind that the author wishes all the preceding parts of his treatise to be directly and indirectly a preparation for his final argument. In these preceding parts (making twenty-four chapters), there are many paragraphs that do not relate directly to any purpose more specific than the advocacy of sound linguistic reasoning, which is carefully distinguished from philological reasoning in its comprehensive reaches. Accordingly a diversity of topics is handled in Dr. Jespersen's original and suggestive manner, with only an occasional touch of severity in criticism, which is always palliated by his unrelenting seriousness. The characteristics of his manner are well-shown in the chapter on "Etymology" (pp. 305-318), which may be mentioned because of the value of some new details, and especially for the emphasis on the fact that this subject has become severely scientific, leaving no encouragement to mere guess-work. But even the scientific method may mislead one into the error of an over-confident acceptance of a result. Thus, in Dr. Jespersen's opinion, Hermann Möller in a "model article," meeting "all the legitimate requirements of a scientific etymology," has solved "the riddle of G. *ganz*" (p. 308).

The second 'book' of the treatise, on the language of the child and its influence on linguistic development, tho abounding in suggestiveness also shows that the author's enthusiasm may at times beguile him into diffusiveness and an excessive citation of evidence of very slight significance, if indeed it be at all pertinent. The discussion could with advantage be considerably condensed. But the general reader will probably find this 'book' especially enter-

taining. He will surely mark the statement that "the two sexes differ very greatly in regard to speech" (p. 146); that in speech-facility little girls surpass the boys; and that this difference persists in adult-life. Dr. Jespersen has overlooked the evidence of the craniologist at this point. Recent investigations are reported to show that the sexes differ in the development of the convolution of Broca. However that may be, there are many sides to this question, and some of these are interestingly discussed in chapter XIII of the next 'book.'

Dr. Jespersen enters upon a critical examination of exaggerated and loosely accepted traditions relating to a difference in language between women and men belonging to the same tribe or linguistic community,—a difference which in its most reduced form has psychological and cultural aspects. "There can be no doubt that women exercise a great and universal influence on linguistic development through their instinctive shrinking from coarse and gross expressions" (p. 246). A feminine revolt against Gongorism and Marinism resulted in the artificiality of *Les Précieuses*. Another generalization is this: "the vocabulary of a woman as a rule is much less extensive than that of a man," for she keeps in "the main road of language, whereas man is inclined to find out new paths (p. 248). Altho "linguistically quicker than man" she is slow to see the point of a pun.

A marked feature of woman's language is the use of adverbs of intensity. Lord Chesterfield heard a "fine woman" declare a small gold snuff-box "to be *vastly* pretty, because it was so *vastly* little." The snuff-box is out of date, but the woman of to-day is *just crazy* about many another object, for that is *so* like her. The literary artist has not overlooked the feminine "stop short or pull up" sentence: 'Well, I never'; 'The trouble you must have taken,' etc. Moreover, in sentence-structure, women are paratactic, men are hypotatic. "In a Danish comedy a young girl" is interrupted in her recital by the exclamation of her brother ("who has slyly taken out his watch"), "I declare! you have said *and then* fifteen times in less than two and a half minutes." In the final sentence of this chapter it is conjectured that the "great social changes" now affecting the world "may eventually modify even the linguistic relations of the two sexes."

A wide range of discerning observations will be recognized in the chapter on "Pidgin and Congeners," but this must now be dismissed from further notice, and commended, together with various other divisions, for the linguistic acumen and instructiveness always characteristic of what is offered by Dr. Jespersen. It may be said, however, that his efficient linguistic reasoning is at times too exclusive of cultural, philological implications; and his marked originality may lead him to put a captious emphasis on unimportant distinctions, as when he pronounces the theory of *nasalis*

sonans "a disfiguring excrescence on linguistic science" (p. 317; *cf.* p. 92). It is also not irrelevant at this point to notice that Dr. Jespersen advocates the manufacture and use of an artificial, international language, and pronounces a favorable judgment on the product Ido (pp. 9, 99; on p. 22 an obligation to Leibnitz is acknowledged).

No scholar can profitably ignore the history of his science. That is true in a very special sense when that history is chiefly in the present-perfect tense, when so much of what is significant in it relates to the present as the basis for further progress. There is not much in the history of the science of language as understood to-day that the scholar may safely pronounce negligible; it is for the most part too recent and plainly suggestive of the next steps to be taken. A sketch of that history is accordingly supplied in Dr. Jespersen's first 'book' (pp. 19-99),—a difficult task well performed.

The first division of this sketch, "Before 1800," supplies suggestive glances at "antiquity," the "Middle Ages and Renaissance," and "Eighteenth-century Speculation" with specific evaluation of Herder as linguistic philosopher and a recall to deserved notice of Jenisch. The latter's analysis of the essentials of language, which results in a formula for comparing and ranking languages is noteworthy. It is declared deeper and more comprehensive than Grimm's "attempt at estimating language" (p. 60), and was the begetter, one may assume, of Dr. Jespersen's contribution to *Scientia,* 1914, "Energetik der Sprache" and of his persistent maintenance of the "energetic views of language" (p. 9).

The science of language being in so specific a sense an attainment of the nineteenth century, a linguistic survey of that period constitutes the chief portion of this 'book' (pp. 32-99). It is brought down from Rask and Grimm to the year 1880, the date of the first edition of Delbrück's *Einleitung* and of Paul's *Principien,* and closed with a brief indication of subsequent "general tendencies." This history, as is well known and here duly acknowledged, has been composed by other scholars. (Attention may be directed to the recent sketch forming the Introduction to Paul's *Deutsche Grammatik*). To these the student will turn with a freshly aroused interest after observing the significantly eclectic chapters in which Dr. Jespersen has so admirably executed his intention "to throw into relief the great lines of development rather than to give many details." His primary purpose in this has been, he declares, to supply "an introduction to the problems dealt with in the rest of the book," in which is therefore demonstrated the vital continuity in the history of linguistic investigation and theory.

J. W. B.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVII NOVEMBER, 1922 NUMBER 7

GERMANISCHES RECKENTUM: frz. *garçon*

1. In dem Charakterbild, das die *Germania* des Tacitus von unsern Altvordern mit der Wahrheitsliebe eines wohlwollenden Ethnographen entworfen hat, leuchtet die Schilderung der germanischen Gefolgschaft hell und klar als Kennzeichen des Germanentums, wie es Caesar als Geschichtschreiber seiner gallischen Kriege von den Galliern nicht berichten konnte. Das Ideal der Treue imponiert dem Römer und ebenso die traditionelle Erziehung zum Heldentum. Der freie Germane muss sich die Anerkennung seines Kriegsruhmes ausserhalb des Heimatstammes holen. Erst dann gilt sein Ansehen als fest begründet, wenn darüber Nachbarstämme die objektive Anerkennung ausgesprochen haben. Solcher Ruhm allein gehört in den Beginn einer Heldenlaufbahn, die dann erst in den Dienst des eigenen Stammes tritt. So hatte Arminius im römischen Heer gedient, ehe er der Retter seiner Heimat wurde. So tritt Siegfried am burgundischen Hofe Gunthers als stammesfremder Held auf, und nur der frühe Tod konnte seine Heldenlaufbahn beschliessen, die später seiner Heimat hätte dienen müssen. Der grosse Theodorich lebte an Attilas Hofe, ehe er nach Italien als dem erbhaften Ziel seines Strebens gelangte. Im angelsächsischen Heldenlied beginnt Beowulf, der nach dem schwedischen Südwesten gehört, am dänischen Hof auf Seeland sein taten- und ruhmreiches Leben, das er später als König seiner Heimat beschliesst. Walter von Aquitanien kämpft und siegt im Hunnenland, aber gelangt schliesslich zu seinem ererbten Königreich.

Glänzender können Behauptungen aus feindlichen Lagern nicht bestätigt werden, als des Römers Bericht durch innere alte Heldensage. Und dass die Treue der Angelpunkt des Lebens im Kriege

wie im Frieden war, das strahlt umso heller, wenn ein Kenner bezeugt, dass im Mittelpunkt der altirischen Heldensage immer der Raub von Viehherden steht.

Für den Typus des jugendlichen Kriegers, der bei einem fremden Stamm erfolgreiche Kriegstaten ausübt, besitzt unsere Vergangenheit das Schlagwort des Reckentums. Von seinen Gewährsmännern hätte Tacitus das Schlagwort *wracio* ermitteln können, wenn er wirkliches Interesse für unsere Barbarensprache gehabt hätte. Aber in den älteren Literaturdenkmälern gehört der Begriff der Heimatferne in den ursprünglichen Wortinhalt, wenn z. B. in der altsächsischen Stabreimdichtung von Christi Erdenwallen sogar die drei Könige aus dem Morgenland *wreckion* d. h. 'Recken' genannt werden. Wir stellen das uralte Wort zu got. *wraka* oder *wrakja* für 'Verfolgung' und übersetzen es mit 'Verfolger.' Ich gebe zu, dass diese mutmassliche Grundbedeutung mir im Verhältnis zum tatsächlichen Wortinhalt 'junger Krieger in fremdem Dienst' nicht durchsichtig ist. Aber der Wortinhalt selbst steht völlig fest, und die Geschichte des Wortes weist in allerlei Bedeutungsvarianten darauf zurück. So kann sich die Bedeutung 'verbannter Krieger' ergeben und in schweizerischen Mundarten tritt, besonders oft in polizeilichen Steckbriefen, eine letzte Entwicklung als 'Landfahrer, Landstreicher' auf. Auf der andern Seite kann der Begriff der Heimatferne auch die Bedeutung 'Unglücklicher' ergeben, wie unser *Elend* ursprünglich bekanntlich auch nichts anderes ist als 'Heimatferne': hier erklärt sich engl. *wretch* 'Unglücklicher,' das mit unserm *Recke* völlig eins ist.

Aber unser Wort, das für die deutsche Urzeit einen so charakteristischen Inhalt hat, zeigt einen weitreichenden Einfluss über die germanische Sprachfamilie hinaus—auf die Welt der romanischen Sprachen. Oder müssten wir es als charakteristisches Wort nicht bei den Romanen erwarten, die gerade aus dem kriegerischen Bereich manches Wort den Germanen der Völkerwanderungszeit abgeborgt haben? Wenn Worte wie *Spiess, Helm* und *Schwertscheide* im 7./8. Jahrhundert latinisiert (*speutum, helmus, fodrum*) und dann auch romanisiert wurden (afrz. *espiet, heaume, fuerre*), dürfen wir unser *wraccio* (*wracionem*) auch im Romanischen suchen, und wir finden es tatsächlich wieder in frz. *garçon* und seinen romanischen Entsprechungen. Denn frz. *garçon* weist nach sicheren Analogien mit gesetzlichem Vokaleinschub zurück

auf ein mlat. *gwaracionem,* wie es bekannt ist, dass der Romane die germ. Anlautsgruppe *wr-* auch durch *war-* und *gwar-* ersetzt (frz. *garance* 'Färberröte' weist durch mlat. *garantia* für **gwarantia* auf ein germ. Wort mit *wr-* Anlaut). Nun fehlen zwar in der Karolingerzeit Belege für ein mlat. **gwaracionem.* Aber seine jüngere Lautform tritt im 11. Jahrhundert mit der Bedeutung 'Trossknecht, Schildknappe' auf, und so hat *garçon* auch im 11./12. Jahrhundert die gleiche Bedeutung. Was aber vollends zum Beweisse dient, ist die Tatsache, dass die romanische Wortfamilie von frz. *garçon* die merkwürdigsten Bedeutungsparallelen zu der germ. Wortfamilie aufweist. "Die üblichste Bedeutung von frz. garçon," sagt Diez im *Etymologischen Wörterbuch der Roman. Sprachen* S. 157, "war im Altfranzösischen nicht 'Knabe,' es hiess 'Diener, Handlanger, Trossknecht,' zumal aber in moralischer Beudeutung 'Lotterbube.'"

So auffällig ein Zusammenhang von frz. *garçon* mit unserm *Recke* auf den ersten Blick erscheinen mag, so sicher berühren sich die beiden Sprachfamilien mit der Grundform *wrakion* in der Bedeutung 'heimatferner Krieger,' die für die Jahrhunderte nach der Völkerwanderung und schon früher geherrscht hat. Hier liegt ein seltsames Beispiel vor, mit welch verschlungenen Fäden Germanisch und Romanisch zusammenhängen; aber noch wunderbarer ist es, wie im Hintergrund das Ideal des germanischen Heldentums steht.

2. Soweit der Wortlaut eines Aufsatzes, den ich während des Weltkrieges in einem Feuilleton der *Frankfurter Zeitung* vom 21. Juni 1916 veröffentlicht habe. Er wurzelt in der hochgehenden Stimmung unserer deutschen Hoffnungen der ersten Kriegsjahre, aber nicht in irgendwelchem Chauvinismus, den exakte Wissenschaft nicht verträgt. Aber seine Anschauung hat sich nicht jeder Fachmann zu eigen machen können, und es bleibt nur zu wünschen, dass diejenigen, die meine Anschauungen alsbald ablehnten, auch nicht von unwissenschaftlichen Gesichtspunkten geleitet worden sind. Ich hätte auf den Verdacht unsachlicher Gründe auch bei Gegnern nicht verfallen können, wenn das Feuilleton der *Frankfurter Zeitung* resp. meine neue Etymologie für frz. *garçon* nicht 1917 zum Gegenstand einer Abwehr geworden wäre. Es entspricht nicht der Gepflogenheit unserer wissenschaftlichen Literaturblätter, die Etymologie einer Tageszeitung zum Gegenstand der Erörterung

zu machen. Bestand doch die Hoffnung, dass ich auf das wichtige Problem meinerseits in einer Fachzeitschrift zurückkommen konnte, wie ich es tatsächlich auch getan habe. Es ist vielleicht das einzige Mal gewessen, dass das *Literaturblatt f. germ. und roman. Philologie* hrsg. von Behaghel und Neumann eine Rezension über ein Feuilleton gebracht hat, als Prof. Leo Spitzer das Wort darüber ergriff (1917 Sp. 302). Aber nachdem ich nunmehr in einem neuen Artikel der *Zeitschrift f. rom. Phil.* 41,684 meine Etymologie fachlich begründet habe, warte ich noch immer vergebens darauf, dass das gleiche Fachblatt auch über meine wissenschaftliche Begründung der neuen Etymologie berichten würde. Und weil auch Meyer-Lübkes *Rom. et Wb.* meine Deutung nicht einmal der Erwähnung wert achtet, darf ich auf das wichtige Problem hier wohl zurückkommen, um zu verhindern, dass meine neue Etymologie weiter unbeachtet bleibt.

Mein Frankfurter Zeitungsartikel beruhte auf blosser Kombination und Konstruktion von mlat. *waracio* und gestand selber ein, dass ich über Belege nicht verfügte. Später habe ich das Wort in einer mlat. Quelle gefunden, die wohl nie ein Romanist durchgenommen oder gar durchgeareitet hat und durcharbeiten wird: das ist das Verbrüderungsbuch (*Liber Confraternitatum*) von St. Gallen, Reichenau und Pfeffers, das Prof. Piper im Jahre 1884 in den *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* herausgegeben hat. Da fand ich zu meiner grossen Überraschung unter Tausenden von Eigennamen auch den Männernamen *Waracio,* wie im gleichen Dokument auch den deutschen Personennamen *Reckjo* als Männernamen. Selten ist eine Grundform mit grösserer Sicherheit konstruiert worden wie in diesem Fall. Und es stellte sich für mich dann bald die Tatsache ein, dass Förstemanns *Namenbuch* das gleiche Wort *Waracio* auch im *Corveyer Urkundenbuch* hrsg. von Wigand (*Traditiones Corbeienses*) als latinisierten Namen zeigt. Diese veränderte Sachlage hätte Spitzer wohl veranlassen dürfen, meine Etymologie abermals zu prüfen und den Lesern des *Literaturblatts* die veränderte Situation vorzuführen. Es kann mir nicht gleichgültig sein, dass Meyer-Lübke's *Rom. et. Wb.* no. 9510 frz. *garçon* auf ahd. *warza* 'Warze' zurückführt; denn ein altfrz. Lehnwort, das auf ahd. *warza* zurückweist, müsste im Urfränkischen doch sicher **warta* lauten, und das kann nicht als romanisches Substrat für frz. *garçon* gelten. Ganz abgesehen davon,

dass keine germanische Spur auf eine Bedeutungsentwicklung 'Warze'—'Bube' (oder 'Mädchen'?) weist.

Die alte Ableitung von frz. *garçon* aus lat. *carduus* (Diez) hat Baist in *Rom. Forschg.* 6, 426 bekämpft. Suchiers Herleitung aus dem Frauennamen *Garsindis* wird unter andern auch von Meyer-Lübke abgelehnt. So darf ich weitere Fachkreise abermals für meine neue Deutung interessieren, ehe sie zur Vergessenheit verurteilt wird.

Dass ich als Germanist diese nicht naheliegende Deutung gefunden habe und finden konnte, erkläre ich damit, dass ich kurz vorher (1912) in meiner *Zeitschrift f. deutsche Wortforschung* 14, 160 die etwas schwierigere Deutung von frz. *garance* aus ahd. *rezza* für **wratjia* 'Färberröte' festgestellt habe.

Geleitet aber hat mich von Anfang an die Forderung, dass einer der wichtigsten und hervorstechendsten Begriffe des deutschen Altertums im Romanischen fehlen würde, wenn sich unser deutsches Wort nirgends wiederfände. Das Latein der alten Römer konnte sich mit *profugus* behelfen, wie es Tacitus *Annal.* 2, 11 getan hat, wenn es von dem Marcomannenführer Catualda heisst (dieser hielt sich als Flüchtling bei den Goten auf): *erat inter Gotones,* war aber kein Gote, sondern *profugus olim vi Marobodui et tunc dubii rebus eius ultionem ausus.* So bot das Latein hinlänglichen Ersatz auch für die ganze Folgezeit, wenn auch der germ. Begriff mit und nach der Völkerwanderungszeit immer kräftiger hervortrat. So ist Ekkehards lat. *Walthariuslied* v. 760 ein sächs. *wrecca* am burgundischen Hof Gunthers zu Worms namens Ekifrid ausreichend gekennzeichnet: *pro nece facta cujusdam primatis eo diffugerat exul.*

Dieser Typus ist in der germanischen Dichtung eine stereotype Figur. Unserm *Siegfried* entspricht im angls. Gedicht vom Überfall in Finnsburg v. 25 Sigeferd als Häuptling der Secgen bei Hnæf, der gekennzeichnet wird als *wreccea wíde cúð.* Der Held der Nibelungensage war eben dieser selbe *wrecca;* beide sind wesensgleich und völlig identisch. Es handelt sich wohl um eine Episode aus Siegfrieds Jugendzeit, ehe er nach Worms kam, und diese Jugendzeit spielte sich in nördlicheren Landen ab. Wenn sich dieser Sigeferd im angls. Gedicht selber vorstellt: "Sigeferd is mín nama, ic eom Secgena léod, wreccea wíde cuð," so musste jeder Hörer sich unwillkürlich auf den Helden der Nibelungensaga besinnen, denn dieser ist der wahre *wreccea wíde cuð.*

Im 2. Teil des Nibelungenlieds ist Attila-Etzel von solchen germanischen Auslandshelden umgeben wie Iring und Hawart aus Dänemark und Irmenfried aus Thüringen. So ist im Spielmannslied von König Rother (12. Jahrb.) v. 1393 der grave Arnolt ein verorloget man beim griechischen Kaiser (vergl. Kögel, *Literaturgesch.* 2, 228). Dem Germanisten ist der Begriff des Reckentums im Bereich der deutschen Heldensage von jeher geläufig gewesen, aber dem Romanisten ist die Figur des *wrecceo* nicht so vertraut. Auch die vielverzweigte Geschichte unseres deutschen Wortes muss man in die Wagschale werfen, wenn man die Bedeutung 'Lotterbube' in afrz. *garçon* mit dem schweiz. *Recke* 'Landstreicher' konfrontiert. Das von mir aufgeworfene Problem mit seinen lautlichen Schwierigkeiten wird des weiteren Ausbaus fähig sein, und das letzte Wort hat sicher der Romanist zu sprechen; aber die afrz. Nebenform *gars garçon* braucht auch der Germanist nicht tragisch zu nehmen.

FRIEDRICH KLUGE.

Freiburg, Baden.

GERMAN LEXICOGRAPHY

PART IV

36. BANK, BANKIRER

Bank, 'Haus für Geldgeschäfte,' is cited by lexicographers from the beginning of the seventeenth century. Schulz[1] regards *Banko* = Italian *banco,* as the original form, whereas the shortened form *Bank,* according to him, did not begin to make headway until about 1700, under the influence of French *banque.* The material here collected, going back in part to the first third of the fifteenth century, does not bear out that statement. And the wealth of instances attests the general currency of the word even at that early period. The examples appear particularly in the correspondence between German princes or municipalities and their agents at the Papal Court, who constantly needed money to further their

[1] *Deutsches Fremdwörterbuch* von Hans Schulz. 1. Bd., Strassburg, Trübner, 1913.

clients' interests. The following passages are taken from the correspondence of the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order in the years 1420-1449:

das sy funffczehenhundert ducaten alhir gelegit hatten yn dy banck de Albertis (*Bunge,*[2] VIII, 48: Supino, 1429). So hot der probist her Arnoldus. . . . 30 gulden us der banck genomen (p. 514: Basel, 1434). Nuremberg . . . da denne dieselben briffe bey czwen koufflewten adir banckirern legen (X, 394: Marienburg, 1449). und besorget sich, das die koufflewte und banckirer solch geld werden innehalden . . . wie das nicht geschege, so mochten die banckyrer czu Rom solch geld so lange als sie welden innehalden (p. 463: Marienburg, 1449).

The next group of examples is from the correspondence between the City Council of Breslau and their Roman agent, published in Vols. VIII and IX of the *Scriptores rerum Silesiacarum:*

Item von dem gelde seyt ir yczunt sicher, wy vil is czu Rome yn der banck leit (VIII, 96: Viterbio, 1462). Auch so sint nach ewers geldes hundert gulden an der bangk; denselbigen wegselbrieff hat der cardinal von Senis (p. 145: Siena, 1462). Hirumme bitte ich, ewer erbarkeit wollen schreiben ken Venedig an die kouffleute, das ich wüste, zu wem ich zuflucht haben solde, wann es in bancko gar swerlich ist ausszubringen (IX, 67: Siena, 1464). der herr Cretensis hat mir geschafft aussz der banck XXX ducaten (p. 90: Rome, 1464). Item ich hab euch gesandt nu aus Ancona per banchum ken Venedig zu Jobsten (p. 94: Rome, 1464). Dorumme wil mir der herr Cretensis aussz der banck heissen geben L gulden (p. 98: Rome, 1464). zu bestellen ken Venedig, das sie schreiben an den bancarium ken Rom, ap mir geldes not wurde (p. 101: Rome, 1464).

The political correspondence of the Elector Albrecht Achilles of Brandenburg likewise furnishes a number of examples:

das er dieselb achtzig ducaten ausz der banck genomen hab . . . me ist es die weyse nicht der kaufleute, das sie wechselbrive in der forme geben, sunder so man die brive zeuhet, so musz man das gelt bezalen. also wenn er das gelt zu Rome ausz dem bancke nymet, gar oder eins teils (*Publ.*[3] LIX, 175 f.: Nürnberg, 1470). nun hat der techand nicht geltz gehabt, die bullen zu entledigen und doch so vil vleis gethan, das die bancquiren zu Rom ubergeben, die sie

[2] *Liv-, Esth- und Curländisches Urkundenbuch* hrsg. von F. G. Bunge, Reval, 1853 ff.

[3] *Publikationen aus den Preussischen Staatsarchiven*, Leipzig, 1878 ff.

herausz in Hannsen Mulners hand zu Nürnberg geschickt haben (p. 356: 1472, but in a much later copy).

Several instances from the early sixteenth century may here be added: den das gelt durch bank hinus gevertiget (*Schiner*[4] p. 135: 1512). des Franzosen ambasiator mit viln bankirn von den Florentinern (*Wyss*[5] p. 83: 1527). cardinal, bischoff, prelaten, bankir plündert, rantziert und ingenommen (p. 84).

Important instances are also found in Latin correspondence of the fifteenth century, for example the following, written from Rome in 1463 by the agent of the city of Breslau:

> nec inveni nisi apud dominum Senensem cyrographum banci, et mihi magnus labor fuit rehabendi eas, nam dominus Johannes Kitczing pie memorie incaute egit cum eis, quod eas ex bancho recepit nomine vestri et deinde eas ad banchum reposuit nomine sui et fecit sibi fieri cirographum in se per banchum; hoc tamen bona fide fecit. Tandem est, opus fuit me litigare cum banchario coram auditore camere, nam allegavit bancharius, quod teneretur illas pecunias domino Johanni aut suis heredibus et non vobis . . . opus fuit me obligare banchario in forma camere sub censuris . . . item unum florenum cum dimidio pro instrumento quietandi bancharium et duobus mandatis ab auditore camere apostolice factis banchario (*Scriptores rerum Silesiacarum* VIII, 178).

A still older Latin instance is found in the *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Lübeck:* in banco Lubecensi apud Rudolffum Cumhar (VIII, 336: 1421). If we now turn back to the German letters above cited, where expressions such as *in bancko, per banchum, den bancharium* are inserted into the German text, it will be seen that Latin influence is much more probable than Italian, even though the letters in question were written from Italy.

37. Wechsel, Wechselbank, Wechselbrief, Wechsler

Two instances of *Wechselbrief,* dated 1462 and 1470, are quoted above, under *Bank.* Additional examples of words belonging to this group are:

[4] *Korrespondenz u. Akten zur Geschichte des Kard. Matth. Schiner,* 1. Bd., Basel, 1920.

[5] *Chronik des Bernhard Wyss,* hrsg. von G. Finsler, Basel, 1901.

des geldis . . . lengirn tag geschaffen mochte adir mit ym ein wechsil bestellin mochte (*Cod. Lus.*[6] II, 240: Görlitz, 1399). Als wir in botin umbe ein wechssel herzubestellin (*ib.*: 1431). das uns her Johannes Menghen . . . by den wechseler nachgelassen haet . . . und das och des geldes by den wechseler villichte so vele nicht is . . . gelt dohyn durch en wechsell haet obirczukoufende (*Bunge,* IX, 35: 1436). das die bestetigsbrieffe durch wechsel bis ken Nuremberg seyn gekomen (X, 394: 1449). das her czuvor die wechselbriffe bey em habe . . . das dem procuratori die wechselbriffe ee bessir ken Rome werden geschicket (X, 401: 1449). ir soldet uns die wechszelbriffe mit den irsten senden (X, 408: 1449). so vil Reynischer gulden, die nach dem wechsel machen funff und tzweintzighundert ducaten (X, 410: 1449). und mit den wechselbriffen vurdan ken Rom gefertiget werde (X, 464: 1449). twelf ducaten, de em Gerardus to Rome ouerscreuen hadde an de wesselbank (*Urkundenbuch der Stadt Lübeck,* VIII, 674: 1449). nit mer dann ein wechseler ist der gen Rom gelt oder wechsel brieff gebe (*Jahrb.*[7] II, 324: Luzern, 1456). bi der gewicht geben am wechsel . . . vor wechsel geben vj tugaten . . . und hat alsso die wechsel brieff geben dissem botten (p. 325). mit solchem geld gen Nurmberg das doselbsten in wechsel zu bringen volfertiget, damit der wechsel dest ee erlangt werde (*Publ.* LXVII, 453: 1479).

It is of course clear that *Wechsel* here means 'exchange,' whereas *Wechselbrief* denotes 'bill of exchange.' The Latin term for this is also found in a Low German letter dated 1437: vnde dat he enen litteram cambii hebbe entfangen (*Urkbch. d. Stadt Lübeck,* VII, 711).

38. Briefträger

This word, usually ascribed to the sixteenth century, appears as early as 1418:

euwirs obersten marschalkes briefftreger und boten weren zurucke zu zihen betwungen (*Bunge,* V, 321). Unnd wenne dyselbigen bothen czu lande komen und paszbrife mit yn brechten, in den sy der pobist schreibe seine bothen, geloubet yn nicht, wenne yn Cubant und her Welter 200 ducaten und sust andere vordernisze geloubet haben czu thun, denselbigen brieftregern (VIII, 198: 1430).

[6] *Codex diplomaticus Lusatiae superioris II,* enthaltend Urkunden des Oberlausitzer Hussitenkrieges, hrsg. v. R. Jecht, 2 Bde., Görlitz, 1896-1904.

[7] *Jahrbuch für schweizerische Geschichte,* Zürich, 1876 ff.

39. Passbrief, Passport

The preceding quotation contains also the earliest instances of *Passbrief* (1430.) Other, somewhat later instances are:

understan söllent on paszport usz dem land zů ziechen (*Jahrb.* XXXIX, 190: 1498). mit zerung, ouch paszporten bitz gan rom (*Schilling,*[8] p. 208: 1507). glait- oder passbrief (*Schiner,* p. 472: 1512). mit paszporten und Urlob heim zogen, und dagegen ettlich on Urlob und paszporten abgescheyden sindt . . . mit Urlob und Paszporten . . . er zoig denn sin gloibich paszporten von mir (*Schw. Gesch.,*[9] I, 226 f.: 1512). uber unser gegebne sicherheit und bosspart (*Unterfr.*[10] p. 83: 1525). Und da bathen sie den newen hertzog umb ein paszport. Die saget in der hertzog zue (*Pruss.*[11] V, 374: 1525). batten . . . auch umb ein paszport (*ib.*) aber sie wolden in gern ein paszbortt geben (*ib.*)

40. Neutralist

The dictionaries cite the word from the seventeenth century. It occurs as early as 1546 in a letter of Schertlin von Burtenbach: Aber die von Ingelstat als vermeinten neutralisten geben jnen prouiandt (*Seb. Schertlin von Burtenbach und seine an die Stadt Augsburg geschriebenen Briefe,* Augsburg, 1852, p. 130). The word occurs again in Burtenbach's *Historia Belli Smalcaldici:* Dann die Neutralisten durch Iren Büchsenmeister Hans Franckh genandt, ab dem Thurn . . . schiessen lassen (J. B. Mencken, *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum,* Lipsiae, 1728, Vol. III, p. 1428).

41. Kredenz

This word, in the sense of English *credentials,* is quite frequent in German diplomatic correspondence of the fifteenth century. Strangely enough, there are instances in all three genders:

vnd taten vnser werbunge vff den credencz, inmaszen uwer gnade vns beuolhen . . . had (*Fontes,*[12] XLII, 217: 1458). haben wir uns zu vnserm herrn von Bressla gefugt vnd durch sin gnade vff

[8] *Diebold Schilling's, des Lucerners, Schweizerchronik,* Lucern, 1862.

[9] *Der schweizerische Geschichtsforscher,* Bern, 1812 ff.

[10] *Archiv des historischen Vereins von Unterfranken und Aschaffenburg,* 36. Bd., 1893.

[11] *Scriptores rerum Prussicarum,* Leipzig, 1861 ff.

[12] *Fontes rerum Austriacarum,* II. Abt., Wien, 1855 ff.

vnsern credencz vnd ettlichen andern . . . vermanet (p. 218). Item zwo credentz, eine an herrn Jorgen kung zu Beheim, die ander an herrn Micheln burggrafe zu Maidburg (p. 351: 1462). der kunig zu Beheymen had mich . . . mit seiner k. g. credentz zu e. f. g. gefertigt, dieselbe credentz ich e. f. g. hirmit schicke (p. 485: 1469). Und als uwer gnade mit uns uff das credentz geredt hat, was nu die in sich holdett, dabei lassen wirs stehen (*Fontes,* XLIV, 58: 1460). hat uwer gnade zu Culmbach mit ubergebin der credentz wol verstanden (*ib.*). Item vnnserm genedigen herrn die credenntz zuuberantworten (p. 91: 1461).

Kredenzbrief, identical in meaning with *Kredenz,* occurs less frequently:

Item das herre Heinrichen, marschalck, von newen volkomene gewalt gegeben werde, des bey den steten mitsampt vnnsern gnedigen herrn auf ewer gnaden ernstlich gebitlich credenczbrief vleisz zuthun (*Fontes,* XLIV, 121: 1461).

42. Miserabel

The dictionaries state that this word came into the language in the seventeenth century, from the French. The following instance, from a letter of Albrecht Achilles of Brandenburg, is of interest not merely on account of its much earlier date, but also as indicating that the word came from the Latin:

so wissen wir nit, nachdem sein sach *miserabilis* stet, wer gelt für in wölt auszgeben, das er sein tochter neme (*Publ.,* LXXI, 91: 1481).

43. Latinist

This word, not recorded in the dictionaries, is likewise from the correspondence of Albrecht Achilles:

ir wollet den brive . . . in deutsch machen lassen, das ich den verstee, dann ir wiszt wol, das ich nicht ein guter latennist bin (*Publ.* LIX, 750: 1474).

44. Küch(e) = Schloss

The dictionaries, as far as I can discover, record no instances of this word used in the sense of 'Schloss,' 'Burg.' Graff, to be sure, does give one meaning of the word as 'taberna,' which may possibly have developed into 'Gasthaus,' 'Haus,' 'Schloss.' The following instances, again from a letter of Albrecht Achilles, are without any doubt to be taken in the sense of 'castle':

Vnd sunderlich so sind im ausz seinen kuchen Stein, Lawff, Heydeck, Hersprugk vnd andern ob iiii^{c} pferden zugetzogen vnd nymants in denselben kuchen bliben (*Fontes*, XLIV, 434: 1462). nachdem er sich allenthalben ausz seinen küchen also hette gesterckt (*ib.*). vnd sie doch wol iii^{c} pferd in vnnsern kuchen haben (p. 435). Item Swobach küch, Guntzenhausen küch, Onoltzpach . . . hundert pferd (p. 436).

45. Aufwiegeln, Aufweibeln

Both Kluge and Grimm cite the earliest instance of *aufwiegeln*, 'concitare, excitare' from Maaler (1561). The word is distinctly Upper German (Luther uses *erregen*), and is etymologically connected with *bewegen*, despite the fact that it likewise appears as *aufwickeln*. The following instances, occurring in Swiss documents dated between 1495 and 1499, are of interest not merely because they antedate those cited in the dictionaries, but also because they are accompanied by a new form *aufweibeln*, from a different root, but used in exactly the same sense as *aufwiegeln*. Moreover, the meaning of these words is here not merely 'to agitate, incite to rebellion' but 'to recruit, enroll for military service.' The essay in question[13] deals with the rivalry of the Milanese and the French, in their efforts to secure mercenaries for their respective armies, and with the measures taken by various Cantons to prevent or punish this foreign recruiting within their territory:

dasz der herzog von Orliens durch sich selbs, den prinzen, hrn marggrauffen von Nüwemburg und hrn von Oren ein merkliche zall knechten ussz unsern und andern der Eidtgnossen orten understatt uffzewiglen und mit denselben widerumb dem herzogen von Mailand . . . widerstandt ze tůnd (p. 9*).

und als Kůni Müller under andern worten rette der ufwigler halb: ob die begriffen, so wurden sy gestrauft, da redte Schlininger (p. 12*).

mit vorbehaltung der uffweibler, die demnauch, ob es sich findt, verrer mogen zů strauffen (p. 48*).

das "uffweiblen und gelöiff" zu verbieten, "es were dann, das yemanns, der des genosz und gemäsz were, durch ritterschaft willen mit der k. mt. gon Rom ryten und darselbs rittersorden und -wirde annemen wöllte: dem ist das erloubt (p. 138*).

[13] "Mailänder und Franzosen in der Schweiz, 1495-1499. Eidgenössische Zustände im Zeitalter des Schwabenkriegs, von Ernst Gagliardi. I. Teil." [*Jahrbuch für Schweizerische Geschichte*, 39. Bd., Zürich, 1914.]

das uf hüt vil der knechten zusamen gen Basel sollent komen und in Oberbrungen züchen wellent und uns etlich ufwigler anzögt sind: da hand wir unseren landvogt . . . empfalt, das er sin ufsechen solle han, ob er die ufweibler mög betreten, die von stund anzunemen (p. 189*).

Der uffwigler halb, och von dero wegen, so hingeloffen und nit wider gewendt sind, haben min herren inen vorbehalten, die mögen ze straffen als si bedunke, und doch das vor allen dingen die uffwigler . . . angenomen werden, und namlich sind die angezöigt für uffwigler (p. 189*).

zůdem das yetz diser zit die unsern aber durch ettlich houptlüt und uffweibler heimlich ersůcht und uffzůbringen understanden werden und versechen uns wol, das derglich an andern enden ouch bescheche (p. 211*).

The first instance on p. 189* is especially interesting, as the two forms *ufwigler* and *ufweibler* are used in the same sentence, thus permitting no doubt as to their absolute identity in meaning. On the other hand, the reference on p. 211* to *houptlüt und uffweibler* indicates that the notion of *Weibel* 'non-commissioned officer' (cf. modern *Feldwebel*) was present in the mind of the writer. This word is identical in etymology with MHG. *weiben,* 'sich hin und her bewegen,' from which *weibeln* is likewise derived.[14]

The word *vffwigung* occurs as early as 1476 in Ochsenbein's *Urkunden der Belagerung und Schlacht von Murten,* p. 229, while Diebold Schilling's *Schweizerchronik,* extending to the year 1509, has numerous instances of *uffwigler, uffwiglen* (pp. 125, 130, 154, 156, 202, 203, 210, 216, 217, 249). The earliest dated instance of *uffwigler* is of the year 1488: Doch die vffwigler sol man an gnad mit dem swert richten (Segesser's *Eidgenössische Abschiede,* III, 1, 299).

In Franconian documents dealing with the Peasants' War, a third form *ufwidler* occurs repeatedly:

der ergangen ufrur ufwidler oder haubtsacher (*Unterfr.* p. 100: 1525). oberster haubtsacher, uffwidler und haubtman der ufrur zu Kitzingen (p. 106: 1525). haubtsacher, ufwidler und fuderer gewest (p. 153: 1526). die ersten haubtsacher und ufwidler in der . . . empörung (p. 157: 1531). gegen dergleichen aufwid-

[14] Concerning the functions of the *Weibel,* who was originally elected by the enlisted men, see Schmeller, *Bayerisches Wbch.,* Stuttgart, 1827-37, IV, 6.

lern der beurischen aufrur (p. 159: 1531). anfenger, ufwidler, haubtsacher und sonderlich furderer (p. 160: 1531). gegen solichen ufwidlern und haubtsachern (*ib.*).

The regular form *aufwigler* occurs three times on p. 161, in a document dated 1531.

W. Kurrelmeyer.

TERMINATION OF QUALIFYING WORDS BEFORE FEMININE NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES IN THE PLAYS OF LOPE DE VEGA

There may be met in Madrid a small element, yet not without culture, who write *mucho hambre, tanto agua* and defend the use of the masculine adjective in such circumstances. Personal curiosity prompted investigation of a section of the literature to discover authority for the writing, if any exists. The plays of Lope de Vega seemed most suitable for the purpose, because of the certainty that local and peculiar usage would be reflected in the speech of his personages, of origin and social status so diverse. Since variations in the concord of the noun and its qualifying word soon began to appear, the inquiry broadened into the study here offered.

I. The Definite Article:

Before Nouns. 1. Before feminine nouns beginning with accented *a* or *ha* Lope employs either the so-called masculine article or the feminine, as a diminishing number of modern writers still elect to do. Various reasons may determine his choice. Those arising from euphony, the desire for variety and the demands of style in its fullest import are perhaps paramount. Tradition may play a part, under the influence of which a closely related group of words may be crystallized into fixity and maintained invariable from generation to generation of writers. In a very large number of cases either *el* or *la* might have been written with the same metrical result.[1] Yet considerations of meter deserve proper recog-

[1] *E. g.* De la alma, que no lo sé 5. 441. 1. 4 (numbers indicate volume, page, column and line of Lope's collected dramas published by the Spanish Academy).

nition. Not that the poet wilfully distorted the syntax with the deliberate intention of securing a predetermined number of syllables. On the contrary, an author who probably wrote an entire act at a sitting might freely avail himself of so simple an addition to his metrical resources as the choice between *el* and *la* would make possible.[2] And in the case of a writer relatively indifferent to such details, the flexibility of the verse and perhaps ease of expression are thus materially enhanced. This principle may serve to explain Lope's preference for *el Andria* to *la Andria* in citing the name of Terence's play, viz.: ¿Quieres el *Andria* de Terencio? 4. 57. 2. 27. *El* is here doubtless the relic of the old feminine *ela* and, if it be so, Lope does not measure up to the modern standard, which requires *la* with proper names of women beginning with accented *a*.[3] Logically *el* might be construed as the true masculine in agreement with *libro* understood, illustrating a species of metonymy common with names of ships, cities, rivers, works of art and some commercial products.[4] But in practice the usage in the literature including Lope's plays is opposed to this construction.[5]

Another conceivable factor operating in favor of *la* should at least be mentioned. Close reading of Lope's plays reveals the fact that *la* with *arca, aspa, ansia, agua* and similar words appears with some regularity in the parts of servants and rustics and perhaps with greater frequency than in the parts spoken by their social superiors. It is not beyond the bounds of probability, there-

[2] *E. g. el* when immediately following a word which terminates in a consonant yields an additional syllable, as in: Por eso es el ansia mia | Mayor 9. 428. 2. 18, as *la* does not do under the same circumstances: Ella es la arpa que en mi oído suena 7. 9. 1. 44.

[3] Bello y Cuervo, *Gramática Castellana*, 1918 edn., *n.* 52, p. 44.

[4] El *Juana*, Hoyerman, *Grammatik der Spanischen Sprache*, Bremen, 1886, p. 121. B_2. *Anm.; el madera, el Plata*, Rivodo, *Entretenimientos Gramaticales*, Paris, 1890. Vol. I, *En.* 9. 3, p. 205 and *En.* 11, p. 108 II; el *Gloria Patri*, Blasco Ibáñez, *La Barraca*, p. 82. 2 (Keniston). It is Bello y Cuervo's contention that any expression when taken out of its proper connection and made to connote special qualities is *ipso facto* masculine, viz., un *Segovia, l. c.*, par. 163. 3 and par. 850. 22. But *cf.* la *Cloaca Maxima*, los famosos *Quos ego*, Pereda, *Pedro Sanchez*, p. 278 and p. 314 (*Obras Completas*, Madrid, 1904, Vol. 13).

[5] *La Raquel, Gram. of Acad.*, par. 82(b), p. 36; la *Clarisa Harlowe*, Pereda, *l. c.*, p. 9, and the following from Lope: la *Electra* 4. 58. 1. 30; *La Sofonisba* 4. 58. 1. 34; *La Tisbe* 4. 58. 1. 37.

fore, that Lope employed this writing as a faint means of drawing class distinctions. Nevertheless, numerical superiority is in Lope as in the other classic writers largely in favor of *el* rather than *la* with the nouns just mentioned.

As a general rule it is preferable to write *la* with *haba, hada, haya* and *jaca.*[6] While this statement is entirely correct in its application to Lope, it is also possible to form a similar small group with which he preferred to write *el.* He employs *el* exclusively with *águila, ave* and *arma* and almost exclusively with *agua, asta* and *hacha,* and it is probable that a merely numerical or accidental preference for *el* might be established in many more individual cases, if an actual enumeration were made. So far as one can judge without noting every example, Lope writes *el hambre* or *la hambre* indifferently. But sporadic cases of *la agua, la asta* and *la hacha,* apparently ranking as exceptions, occur in the speeches of the servant class and Moors. For it is chiefly by trivial peculiarities rather than by flagrantly bad usage that Lope reveals his humble personages in their true light. That the same character may at another time employ these words in a way more in consonance with general usage does not damage the validity of the inference.[7] For a fool may hit the mark once. The very wavering between *la asta* and *el asta, la agua* and *el agua* may be indicative of the speaker's ignorance, while such a conception of the part may be accorded as a true stroke of character painting to the author who created it.[8]

[6] Rivodo, *l. c.*, Vol. 1, *Cap.* II, *En.* 11, p. 94. See statement of Ureña (*RFE.* 8, p. 370) that these words are still pronounced by the peasants of Santo Domingo with strong aspiration.

[7] Que la agua no se pierda y nos anegue 4. 350. 2. 32 is spoken by Gil; Volved a Santa Fe la asta y la espada 11. 241. 1. 24, by Tarfe. But Tarfe also says *el asta* 11. 244. 2. 27 and 245. 1. 39. There may be other mitigating circumstances: the Alcalde de Zalamea says: De la agua vertida, dicen, | No toda cogida 12. 576. 1. 32, which is popular. *Cf.* Correas, *Vocabulario de Refranes y Frases Proverbiales,* Madrid, 1906, p. 58, Col. 2. *La agua* is said in *Poema del Cid,* 558. *Cf.* Cuervo, *Apuntaciones Criticas,* Paris, 1907, par. 202 (end).

[8] The speeches of Moors and other foreigners often contain unfamiliar and even bizarre forms traceable to the fact that the actors are made to carry over into the Spanish without change certain words of their native tongue. Thus we find *il alma* in the following lines attributed to the attendant of an Italian lady at Palermo: Il alma que yan si aliegra | Decimo logo a la niegra 4. 370. 1. 33.

Cervantes did not write in *Don Quijote,* at least, *el A* and *el H.* Lope, also, though he invented ample occasion to introduce the names of the letters of the alphabet, avoided saying *el A* for the most part and *el H* entirely.[9] The examples are given below and the following special circumstances may be noted concerning them: first, that all are found in those of Lope's dramas which are least praised for their merit; second, that several are taken from passages spoken by the infatuated lover, Silvio, in the simple surroundings of a pastoral drama, and the remainder are in the remarks of servants, who merely re-echo a previous statement of one of their number.[10] On the whole, therefore, Lope's treatment of the point is not loose and in it we may see usage beginning to crystallize into the strictness which the best writers of the present time exemplify.

Rivodo has suggested[11] that the employment of *el* with so many familiar substantives of the feminine gender beginning with *a,* although it is justified, began to cause uncertainty in regard to the gender of those nouns and resulted in the fluctuations which we are now recording. When there is no other qualifying word which will serve to indicate gender, it is impossible to state categorically that a given author felt *alma* or *Arabia* as masculine when he wrote *el alma* or *el Arabia.* So long as we find the accompanying adjective feminine, as in *toda el alma,* we must admit that the writer was fully cognizant of the gender. On the other hand, if we could discover examples of the false agreement, *todo el alma,* the conjunction of masculine adjective with mascu-

[9] Either writing is said to be correct. *Cf.* Bello y Cuervo, *l. c.*, 271, p. 71. But *cf. Gram. of Acad.* 82(e), p. 36.

[10] Con que se le añade el A 5. 725. 1. 19; Dió el A. Querrás dese modo 5. 725. 1. 22; Pues juntas dicen el A 5. 725. 2. 13; Que el A es el padre 4. 519. 2. 53; Pues yo tomo el A primera 3. 371. 1. 7; Me agrado del A postrera 3. 371. 1. 10; Mas ¿ qué dice el A primera? 3. 371. 2. 12; Pero diga el A postrera 3. 371. 1. 28. See Vol. 5, Int., pp. lxv and lxviii; Vol. 4, Int., p. cxxiii. It should be mentioned in explanation of: Que el A es el padre that San Isidro is the speaker and we should expect him to say *el A* in preference to *la A* in anticipation of *padre.*

[11] *L. c.*, Vol. 1, *En.* 11, VII, p. 96; cf. "Toca el arpa, Adelina, tócalo" cited by Cuervo, *l. c.*, par. 203. See Menéndez Pidal's word of warning in regard to the gender of *ora* and *ermana* in the *Poema del Cid* on the basis of *el ora, el ermana* (*Cantar de Mio Cid,* Madrid, 1911, I, par. 61, *notes*).

line article would yield strong presumptive evidence of weakening in gender in this class of nouns. And a few examples [12] of the kind do appear. These, which will be given in full elsewhere, assume importance by showing with some clearness that even good writers were hesitant as to the gender of feminine nouns immediately preceded by the masculine article.

2. It was deeply embedded in poetic usage of the seventeenth century to write *el* occasionally for *la* with feminine nouns beginning with unaccented *a*.[13] Cervantes availed himself of the privilege even in *Don Quijote,* yet with no great frequency. Hence in reading Lope's plays the vast number of examples [14] excites our surprise. The reasons for the alternation from *la* to *el* are identical with those discussed in the previous caption. Not a few of the cases are the proper names of provinces and Moorish fortresses. To one reading connectedly the ballads, the pleasing effect of the slight change from *la* to *el* with the constantly recurring *Alhambra, Andalucía* and a few others will long remain in the memory. Hence the ease, perhaps, with which Lope's characters pass from *la Alhambra* to *el Alhambra, la Andalucía* to *el Andalucía.* These survivals of a period rich in action and vigorous expression would come to the ear as an echo of the past suggesting the sturdy phrase of epic and romance.

3. In the literature prior to the sixteenth century, it was considered correct to write *el* with feminine nouns beginning with *e;* hence *el espada* was good Spanish. In Cervantes' time the practice was becoming obsolete, if it ever had been common,[15] and no example can be found in *Don Quijote.* In Lope's plays, too, the usage is practically non-existent.[16] But the number of examples is legion where the masculine article is mistakenly used with feminine nouns of any vocalic or consonantal beginning whatever.

[12] . . . a todo el África 14. 158. 1. 6.

[13] Bello y Cuervo, *l. c.*, par. 272, p. 71, *n.*; *el harina* is still said in Burgos. *Cf.* García de Diego, *Elementos de Gram. Hist. Cas.*, Burgos, 1914, par. 149, p. 128.

[14] El amatista, el Aurora, el amistad, el aldea, el Alcazaba, el Andalucía, el Alhambra, el América, el Arcadia.

[15] M. Pidal, *l. c.*, I, par. 61, p. 232; Rivodo, *l. c.*, Vol. I, *En.* 11, p. 95; Bello y Cuervo, *l. c.*, par. 271.

[16] The only exception: Para vos no está el escala 5. 694. 1. 10, is spoken by a gardener.

These are premeditated errors in gender and serve to direct attention to Lope's method and art of constructing the parts of the unlettered and of all who do not speak Spanish as their native tongue. He is rich in resources for harmonizing character and speech. But he executes his purpose with flowing pen and does not give lavishly of thought or of that skill which seeks perfection in detail. Rarely does he allow his characters to commit errors in the concord of the verb, or confuse words of similar sound but different meaning, or practise false formations, as many more careful playwrights both ancient and modern have made their personages do.[17] Rather does he remain content with unstudied methods which yield less subtle effects. His unvarying device in attaining dramatic consistency in this regard is to attribute to the speaker ignorance of gender.[18]

The masculine article with *Eva* does not constitute an error in gender in the two following examples: Qa que trocó en Ave el Eva 5. 299. 2. 47 and: Oh tú, que convertiste el Eva en Ave 4. 321. 2. 16. Vice and a masked demon respectively are the speakers and express their thoughts with the correctness and point which have ever marked the arguments of the children of darkness. The words refer to Jehovah. It will be noticed that *Eva* is *Ave* with the letters in reverse order. Therefore the expression is of proverbial nature referring to the powers of a great creator or magician, who can bring to pass transcendent effects or reverse the order of nature. It constitutes a second example of metonymy already discussed; perhaps *vocablo* or *término* is to be thought of as the broader term which really determines the gender of the article.

[17] Provincials exhibit the peculiarity of pronouncing Castilian with a thick or even lisping accent; Moors are made to voice the voiceless consonants (tamboco 12. 154. 1. 8; roba 12. 163. 1. 57; bobre 12. 163. 1. 56), to omit diphthongization of the vowels (el forza 12. 163. 2. 21, vejo 12. 163. 1. 58) or err in some other detail of pronunciation (lievar 5. 41. 1. 7; maniana 5. 43. 2. 4).

[18] A few from very many of these examples of Castilian as it should not be spoken will suffice: el fe 2. 192. 1. 43; del cara 2. 192. 2. 28; el fiesta 2. 96. 1. 4; el chimenea 11. 157. 1. 32; el roca 12. 163. 2. 29; del olla 5. 60. 2. 6; al horta 5. 42. 1. 28. Some caution is necessary not to include in the list nouns which at that time were either masculine or feminine, but are no longer so: el puente 2. 435. 2. 33; la Puente 2. 437. 1. 40. *cf. Gram. of Acad.* p. 7, 17 b.

Before Adjectives. 1. The classic poets extended the writing of the so-called masculine article to adjectives also beginning with accented *a,*[19] but did not convert privilege into license. Although a number of cases can be cited from Lope's plays, it becomes relatively small when the great volume of his work is considered; and there is palliation in the fact that the peculiarity is virtually confined to the very common adjectives *alta* and *ancha.*[20] *La alta* and *la ancha* having become familiar from much use, poetic reasons would explain and justify the slight variation. It is possible to find after prolonged search examples in modern poets, also.[21]

2. In writing *el* with *alta* and *ancha* the poet is within the bounds of the recognized usage of his time. But inasmuch as *el* is extended from nouns beginning with accented *a* to nouns beginning with unaccented *a,* we might expect a similar extension to adjectives under the same circumstances. Nor does the expectation prove vain, for Lope is equal to this extension, furnishing, however, only one example.[22] The correctness of the passage is not open to question. The necessity for an additional syllable is probably sufficient explanation of the peculiarity.

II. Words that Suffer Apocopation:

Algún mohatra o prestado 10. 15. 1. 34 is doubtless an inadvertence, as are also: E quebramos un costilla 5. 60. 1. 30 and:

[19] Bello y Cuervo, *l. c.,* 271 and 272 *notes.*

[20] The remaining adjectives before which *el* might be written are: *ágil, agria, alba, apta, alma, amplia, anua, ardua, áspera, aurea* and *hábil.* Owing to their meaning and their position with reference to the substantive, the feminine article would seldom appear in immediate contact with any of these adjectives. The examples with *ancha* are: el ancha cava 6. 169. 1. 23; el ancha cuchilla 12. 133. 2. 11 (spoken by Pacheco); with *áspera* are: el áspera montaña 8. 138. 1. 16; el áspera grana 12. 162. 1. 26 and the remainder are with *alta:* el alta cerca 15. 475. 1. 11; del alta empresa 8. 219. 1. 12; al alta esfera 6. 457. 2. 1; él alta Alemania 2. 433. 1. 11.

[21] Estalla al fin, y rinde el ancha copa. Andrés Bello, *Silva, A la Agricultura de la Zona Tórrida.*

[22] El antigua amistad que tengo a un hombre 14. 142. 1. 11. Equally uncommon is the combination in the ballads, also. From an entire volume of the *Romancero General* may be quoted only: Por el alevosa muerte | Del rey Don Sacho su primo. *Bibl. de Autores Esp.,* 10, p. 511, No. 790.

Poner un barda, un xamuga 5. 41. 1. 6. The apocopation[23] is intended to illustrate the ease with which Moors might wander from the straight and narrow path of gender in speaking Spanish. Hence these may be dismissed as studied cases of incorrect usage. Of a different character are several in which *una* is apocopated before *alta*. Yet the shortened form does not occur with *ancha* or *áspera*.[24] A plausible explanation is that because of the very diffusion of *alta* there would be greater reason to introduce variations with it as a corrective of triteness. Examples, though nowhere numerous, can be reproduced in the ballads and even in more recent poetry written in the spirit of the ballads.[25] It follows that *un alta* was current as a poetical phrase, correct because usage made it so.

III. Demonstrative Adjectives:

It was a decided peculiarity if not an anomaly at any period to write *este alma*, whether in prose or verse. And yet this usage occurring in the earliest literary monuments maintained itself for a considerable time.[26] Lope, however, displays some partiality for that writing. It is a question whether he deserves censure more than praise. The classic writers avoided as much as possible the use of *a* before another tonic *a*[27] and it has now become evident that Lope had an exceptionally sensitive ear for discordant combinations and in his effort to eliminate them was willing to prac-

[23] Of course examples abound of apocopation common at that time but not so usual now: algún ave 4. 4. 1. 9; la primer huerta 10. 99. 1. 45; la postrer sentencia 5. 118. 2. 38; un aya 10. 137. 1. 23.

[24] A un alta cruz 13. 530. 2. 33; en un alta torre 6. 85. 1. 42; un alta sierra 13. 147. 2. 21.

[25] Un alta roca, *Romancero General* I, No. 405, p. 268; un alta empresa, No 521, p. 354; un alta torre, No. 836, p. 534; Duke of Rivas, *Romances Históricos:* Ve, al doblar un alta roca | Del faro amigo la estrella. (*Colección de Autores Cas.*, 115, p. 53). I do not find this apocopation mentioned by any grammarian whom I have consulted. It should be a relic of the earlier period, yet it does not occur in the *Poema del Cid* where apocopation of *una* is rare even with nouns beginning with a vowel, *e. g.*, *almofalla* and *ora* (Menéndez Pidal, *l. c.*, I, par. 62, p. 233, and par. 49. 3).

[26] Menéndez Pidal, *l. c.*, I, par. 127; Salvá, *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana*, Paris, 1849, 350. 1.

[27] Salvá, *ibidem*.

tise extension beyond recognized limits.[28] Other writers of the period, if the text be correct, have written *este* with feminine nouns beginning with atonic *a,* also.[29] This Lope has not done.

IV. Other Adjectives:

Of considerable interest and importance because of the tendency which they indicate are such expressions as *todo el África,* previously but only cursorily, mentioned. This coupling of masculine adjective with feminine noun owing to the juxtaposition of *el* appears sporadically in the literature only to meet with severest condemnation from purists.[30] The examples[31] from Lope furnish as strong evidence as any could do of the careless workmanship of which at times he was guilty. They do more. They add their mite of proof to the fact that the word group *toda el* is unnatural and tends to yield to *todo el.* When this has happened, the noun has become for the moment masculine.

We finally come to the point which suggested the entire study. The only indication throughout Lope's many pages that an adjective immediately preceding and agreeing with a noun of the *alma* class could assume masculine form is contained in a passage[32] the uncouth barbarity of which renders serious consideration of its structure almost unnecessary. The expression itself is *mocho agua* 2. 191. 1. 4. The part is written to be spoken by a Morisco.

[28] The list is only partial, of course: Ese alma 9. 602. 2. 45; ese agua 11. 118. 1. 21; este aspa 12. 309. 2. 41; ese hacha 5. 241. 2. 28; este águila 12. 602. 1. 8; aquel alma 11. 137. 2. 36; aquel Arca 4. 351. 1. 23.

[29] Calderón, *El Alcalde de Zalamea,* I, 654: Este ayuda; Menéndez Pidal, *l. c.,* par. 127.

[30] Salvá, *l. c.,* 144. 7: sin que pueda sufrirse *el alma atribulado* ni

Mientras vuela risueño
El aura de la vida

como ha dicho Lista. *Cf.* Rivodo, *l. c.,* Vol. 1, *En.* 11, VI, p. 95. See, also, Cuervo, *l. c.,* par. 203 for examples drawn from writers of the New World.

[31] Todo el alma se me abrasa 9. 426. 1. 40; Que dió a España majestad, | Y a todo el África miedo 12. 488. 1. 9; Valor tengo que puede a todo el África . . . Suceder en gobierno 14. 158. 1. 6. But *todo* is correct in: Todo el Alhambra baja 11. 157. 2. 7 and the example may point the way to one source of irregularity in the preceding phrases.

[32] The lines are: Alea engarganta la olia | A vox que mete a esconderme, | Per no passar el tragonte | De mocho agua e mochos peces. *Cf.* Ticknor, *Span. Lit.,* 2. 297, *n.*

Though no other example of disagreement occurs in the case of an adjective, petty errors of gender in the use of articles are found as well as errors in pronunciation and other evidences of imperfect acquaintance with Castilian Spanish. With no other example more significant than this before us, our conclusion on the point is reasonably safe. Lope wrote consistently *mucha agua, poca agua, mucha hambre.* If he did not go so far as to say *mucho hambre,* it is correct to infer that no expression [33] of this kind is to be found in any reputable author of the time.

H. M. Martin.

University of Illinois.

A FORGOTTEN LOVELACE MANUSCRIPT

Few seventeenth century lyrics are better known or more admired than Lovelace's *To Lucasta: On Going to the Wars* and *To Althea: From Prison.* On these two poems Lovelace's reputation rests. By snipping away undesirable stanzas, makers of anthologies have produced two or three other passable poems, but after all, no one cares much about *The Rose, The Grasshopper,* or *To Amarantha: That She Would Dishevel Her Hair,* even in their altered form. The extraordinary excellence of the poems *To Lucasta* and *To Althea* gives a special significance to any question involving the text of either one of them.

When Professor Schelling published his edition of seventeenth century lyrics in 1899, he printed lines 7 and 8 of *To Althea* as follows:

> The gods that wanton in the air
> Know no such liberty;

adding in the notes: "Gods. The original reading. There is no authority for *birds,* the usual reading." [1] Others have followed him in printing *gods* instead of *birds.*[2]

[33] *Mucho hambre* is current among Chileans and perhaps the inhabitants of other South American countries. Cuervo, *l. c.,* par. 203; Menéndez Pidal, *l. c.,* par. 127; Roman, *Diccionario de Chilenismos,* Santiago de Chile, 1913, under *hambre.*

[1] F. E. Schelling, *A Book of Seventeenth Century Lyrics,* p. 267.

[2] W. C. Bronson, *English Poems* (The Elizabethan Age and the Puritan

Schelling, to be sure, had, for the restoration of *gods* to the text, the authority of the first edition of *Lucasta,* which Wood says Lovelace himself prepared for the press. It is, however, to be questioned whether Schelling sufficiently considered the arguments that might be advanced for emendation. To begin with, *birds* pretty obviously makes the more sensible reading. Indeed it can hardly be doubted that Lovelace had birds rather than the Greek and Roman divinities in mind. Professor Grierson offers, in my opinion, the only possible defense of the text when he says: "The 'Gods' probably are the birds. Compare Aristophanes, *The Birds,* ll. 685-723, translated by Swinburne, *Studies in Song.*" Yet it scarcely seems as though even so careless an artist as Lovelace would have wantonly destroyed the manifest parallelism between *fishes* and *winds* below by choosing to write *gods* instead of *birds.* And certainly the climax

> Angels alone, that soar above,
> Enjoy such liberty

is seriously weakened by the previous mention of gods.

Another argument for emendation was brought forward by Hazlitt as long ago as 1864 in his edition of Lovelace.[3] Hazlitt called attention to a manuscript of the poem in the possession of Philip Bliss. This manuscript, which appears to be contemporary with Lovelace, was printed by Bliss in his edition of Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses.*[4] Here the reading is *birds* instead of *gods.* Hazlitt felt that this manuscript evidence, coupled with many gross typographical errors in the original text, justified his printing *birds.* But Bliss himself had been somewhat doubtful, and others have apparently not been convinced.

There is, however, another hitherto unnoticed piece of evidence, which makes the case still clearer for the emended reading. In 1802 there appeared in the *British Critic*[5] an anonymous review of Ellis's *Specimens of Early English Poets.* In a foot-note the

Period), p. 296; F. B. Snyder and R. G. Martin, *A Book of English Literature,* p. 116; H. J. C. Grierson, *Metaphysical Lyrics & Poems of the Seventeenth Century,* p. 61.

[3] W. C. Hazlitt, *Lucasta,* p. 118.

[4] London, 1813-20; 3. 461. The Bliss MS. is now in the British Museum (Add. MS. 22603, f. 16).

[5] 19. 621.

author gave variant readings from still another manuscript of *To Althea: From Prison,* a British Museum manuscript in the Harleian collection, No. 2127. I have nowhere else seen any allusion to it. It differs in many respects from both the Bliss version and the printed version, but here again we have the reading *birds.* As in the case of the other, this manuscript is apparently contemporary with Lovelace.[6] Thus we have two manuscripts both of which support an obviously desirable emendation. Even the most cautious textual critic, it seems, should be reassured by this second manuscript.

Though the primary interest of this forgotten manuscript doubtless lies in its support of an important emendation, there is an intrinsic interest attaching to any additional version of so famous a poem. Since it has apparently never been printed or even correctly collated, a somewhat careful examination of it, and a comparison of its readings with those of the other two versions, may be worth while. It is without title. Twenty-one of its 32 lines show verbal variations from the printed version, as against 12 lines in the Bliss manuscript; and the two manuscripts agree in their departures from the printed version in four lines only. The following are a few of its more interesting differences from the printed version. Flowing cups run "sweetly" instead of "swiftly" round. For "When healths and draughts go free," we have "And healths in bowls run free." Instead of "When, like committed linnets, I" we have "When, linnets-like committed, we." For "Minds innocent and quiet take" we have "A spotless mind and innocent." Finally a rather important difference lies in the use of the first person plural instead of the singular throughout the third and fourth stanzas.

But instead of quoting further variations, I shall give the Harleian version in full, modernized in respect to punctuation and spelling for the sake of more convenient comparison with the familiar version.

When Love with unconfined wings
Hovers about my gates,

---

[6] The manuscript experts at the British Museum are of the opinion that "both copies are in all probability earlier than 1649, the date of the publication of *Lucasta*, and later than 1642, the alleged date of the composition of the poem."

And my divine Althea sings
  And whispers at my grates;
When I lie tangled in her hair
And fettered in her eye,
The birds that wanton in the air
  Know no such liberty.

When flowing cups run sweetly round,
  With no allaying Thames,
Our careless heads with roses crowned,
  Our loyal hearts with flames;
Whilst thirsty grief in wine we steep,
  And healths in bowls run free;
Fishes that tipple in the deep
  Know no such liberty.

When, linnets-like committed, we
  With shriller notes do sing
The glory, might, and majesty
  And goodness of our king;
When we shall vote aloud how good
  He is, how great should be,
Enlarged winds that curls the flood
  Know no such liberty.

Stone walls can not a prison make,
  Nor iron bars a cage:
A spotless mind and innocent
  Calls that an hermitage.
Whilst we have freedom in our love
  And in our souls are free,
Angels alone that soar above
  Enjoy such liberty.

A detailed comparison of the variations justifies a few general observations. First, the number and nicety of the differences suggest the work of the poet himself in experimentation, revision, and polishing. We can hardly avoid the conclusion that the slovenly Lovelace for once applied the Jonsonian file. The great majority of his poems show only too clearly how hastily and carelessly he tossed them off, but here there seems to have been much weighing and testing. The version he finally printed is pretty clearly the best, but it is not much better than the others. Evidently Lovelace in this case carried revision beyond the point where many conscientious poets would have stopped. Wood tells us that it was during his imprisonment for presenting the Kentish petition

that "he made that celebrated song, *Stone walls do not a prison make.*" Perhaps his seven weeks of confinement in the Gate House at Westminster gave him not only the theme of his poem, but the enforced leisure to revise it, in which case the miracle of its perfection would be made the least bit more intelligible.

The value, then, for us, of this manuscript, apparently overlooked for a hundred and twenty years, lies, first, in the additional support it gives for an emendation which on æsthetic and logical grounds seems highly desirable; secondly, in its hint that what Jonson would call art (as opposed to nature) may have had a larger part than we have suspected in making *To Althea: From Prison* Lovelace's masterpiece.

A. C. Judson.

The University of Texas.

SHELLEY'S DEBT TO ALMA MURRAY

The most ambitious and spectacular activity of the Shelley Society was the performance of *The Cenci* at the Grand Theatre, Islington, on May 7, 1886.[1] On that date Alma Murray (Mrs. Alfred Forman) established her reputation as the leading actress of English literary drama. Back of this performance lies the unacknowledged debt of Shelley's literary reputation to a woman, whose contribution is probably inferior only to that of Mary Shelley and Lady Shelley. Undoubtedly the usefulness of the Shelley Society to its idol was to some extent made possible, and was certainly very greatly increased, by the activities of this actress, whose lifelong ambition had been to create the part of Beatrice in a stage production of *The Cenci.* One cannot justly understand the development of Shelley's reputation without appreciating Alma Murray's share in it.

In 1884, before the formation of the Shelley Society, Miss Murray had already attracted attention as a charming and intelligent actress of literary drama. Her successful acting in that year of Constance in Browning's *In a Balcony* was the subject of a paper,

[1] Mrs. Forman informs me that the date was chosen as a compliment to Robert Browning, who was born on May 7.

Miss Alma Murray's Constance in Robert Browning's "In a Balcony," read by B. L. Mosely before the Browning Society on February 27, 1885, and afterwords printed both in *The Theatre* for May, 1885, and in a privately issued pamphlet. In this paper Mr. Mosely makes two incidental comparisons of the rôles of Constance in Browning's poem and of Beatrice in Shelley's *The Cenci,* and concludes: "May we not, then, in the light of these circumstances, venture to look forward with some degree of hope to a revival, at Miss Alma Murray's hands, of some of our old tragic glories, with, perhaps, the creation of the one or two great rôles in our poetic literature yet virgin to the life-touch of the actress?"

In July, 1885, after having previously played the part of Colombe in Browning's *Colombe's Birthday,* Alma Murray gave a reading of the last scene of *The Cenci* before the Wagner Society. This reading was noticed and favorably criticized by a number of the London papers.[2] Some of the papers suggested that *The Cenci* be acted entire. *The Artist* for August, 1885, in commenting on Miss Murray's reading, says, "It is an open secret that she intends, sooner or later, creating the rôle of Beatrice in a stage representation of the play." At the time, however, it hardly seemed likely that this ambition could be accomplished, for theatrical managers were shy of the play, principally on account of the incest-motive. Miss Genevieve Ward had entertained a similar hope, only to have it dashed by managerial unwillingness to risk a production. She had even attempted to organize a private production.[3] Several managers at other times had considered producing the play only to decide that it did not have the elements of stage success.[4]

The Shelley Society was formed between December 6, 1885 and March 10, 1886.[5] Its formation at this particular time was a very auspicious circumstance for Miss Murray. She had cherished a lifelong ambition to create the part of Beatrice Cenci. She had already won a moderate reputation in Shakespearian rôles and had become a distinguished actor and interpreter of literary drama. Her recent work for the Browning Society and in Dr. Todhunter's *Helena in Troas* had brought her to the notice of some of the same

[2] See the *Shelley Society Notebook,* pp. 12-14, for excerpts.
[3] *Shelley Society Notebook,* p. 55.
[4] E. S. Bates, *A Study of Shelley's Drama, The Cenci,* p. 26.
[5] *Op. cit.,* p. 7.

group that constituted the Shelley Society. One of her admirers had already published the hope that she would create the one or two great feminine rôles of literary drama yet unacted, and had indicated the part of Beatrice Cenci as one of those rôles. Within three months after the appearance of Mr. Mosely's article in *The Theatre, The Artist* was announcing that Alma Murray intended creating the rôle of Beatrice—an undertaking that had several times been proposed to the regular stage and refused. Within six months after the successful reading before the Wagner Society the Shelley Society was formed with the avowed primary purpose of producing *The Cenci.* "On the very day on which the Shelley Society was first suggested to its energetic founder," to quote the exact words of the secretary,[6] Alma Murray was offered the part of Beatrice Cenci. One might naturally think of this series of events as having definite connection, and originating within the capable brain of the actress herself or of one of the friends who were responsible for the series of privately printed pamphlets about her art. Unfortunately for such a theory, however, Alma Murray herself states in a recent letter that "neither I nor my friends had anything to do with the formation of the Shelley Society, and my first knowledge of it was when I received a card from Dr. Furnivall asking me to play Beatrice."

After the society had been proposed Miss Murray was one of its most energetic promoters. She set to work immediately and rendered valuable service in completing the cast. When the production was threatened through the refusal of the Censor to allow a public performance, she secured the use of the Grand Theatre at Islington for a "private" performance. Her services are especially mentioned by the secretary of the society: "To Miss Murray a large share of the debt due for the coming performance is owing. Miss Murray has since its foundation worked most energetically and untiringly for the Society, which also owes her the introduction of a large number of members and the acquisition of the Grand Theatre. . . . The performance of *The Cenci* has been the means of enrolling at least one hundred members."[7] Since the society never had over 402 members[8] it will be seen that Alma Murray, in addition to her other services, was responsible for the accession of at least a fourth of the membership.

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 11.
[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 36.
[8] *Shelley Society Papers*, Appendix, p. 22.

The performance of *The Cenci* failed in its main purpose, the demonstration of Shelley's fitness for the stage. All the critics, however, were agreed upon the extraordinary quality of Alma Murray's acting. Robert Browning wrote her a personal letter of appreciation. Lady Shelley acknowledged the poet's indebtedness by presenting Miss Murray with a locket containing a miniature of Guido's portrait of Beatrice and a lock of the poet's hair. The London press and even the provincial papers gave her extended and enthusiastic notices, excerpts from many of which were later embodied in the *Shelley Society Notebook*. Her triumph was sufficiently impressive to cause the London *Evening News,* a year after the event, to seek an interview about the performance. The Shelley Society was especially appreciative in its publications, and five privately printed pamphlets [9] testify to the enthusiastic activity of Miss Murray's friends.

This personal triumph of Alma Murray's was in a sense the poet's also. Although Shelley was not at this time the comparatively obscure poet whose death had occasioned only a perfunctory and inaccurate obituary notice in the *Gentleman's Magazine,* he had by no means attained the preëminence he enjoys today. The performance of *The Cenci,* with its numerous press notices, gave a much more general currency to Shelley's name. To his principal character creation it gave a brief but vital reality that had never before been widely recognized. Even though the play failed to prove Shelley a great practical dramatist, there can be no doubt that it greatly enlarged the number of his readers. For this, in the language of the secretary, a large share of the debt "is owing" to Alma Murray.

In the same measure a great deal of what was accomplished for Shelley by the Shelley Society was made possible by Miss Murray. This society, an organized body for promoting the understanding and appreciation of the poet, included men like Dr. Furnivall, Henry Sweet, Alfred and Buxton Forman, Robert Browning, W. M. Rossetti, and George Bernard Shaw—men whose words carried

[9] *Shelley's Beatrice Cenci and her First Interpreter, Alma Murray,* anon., 1886; *Miss Alma Murray as Beatrice Cenci,* by B. L. Mosely, 1887; *The First Performance of Shelley's Tragedy, The Cenci,* anon., 1887; *An Interview with Miss Alma Murray—Her Opinions on The Cenci,* reprinted from the Evening News, 1887; and *Alma Murray—Portait as Beatrice Cenci,* etc., anon., 1891.

some literary influence. Their activity undoubtedly contributed a great deal toward consolidating and extending Shelley's literary reputation. In the few months preceding the production of *The Cenci* the society published eight volumes of Shelleyana. It was responsible for the publication of several excellent critical papers, notably W. M. Rossetti's analysis of *Prometheus Unbound,* for the public production of *Hellas* and *The Cenci,* and for new editions of *Hellas* and *The Cenci.* H. S. Salt's *A Shelley Primer* and John Todhunter's *A Study of Shelley,* two of the books most valuable to the general reader of Shelley's works, were produced by members of the Shelley Society and appeared during the active existence of that body. The former, in fact, appeared as a Shelley Society publication. Forman's edition of Shelley's works, still the standard and definitive edition, and Lady Shelley's *Shelley Memorials* appeared several years before the formation of the society, but have strong Shelley Society affiliations, as does Dowden's biography of the poet, which was published during the first year of the society's existence. All the Shelley Society's activity, which plays an important part in the estimation in which the poet is now held, was necessarily conditioned upon its existence as an organized, productive body. This existence was brought about avowedly with the primary purpose of staging *The Cenci* and ended shortly after the production of the play. When the society declined, the secretary stated that a large part of the membership had joined simply and solely on account of this production. Alma Murray had been principally responsible both for the possibility of the production and for its one undisputed element of success. She had also been responsible, directly and personally, for the acquisition of a part of the membership. In the light of these facts the poet's debt to her becomes both considerable and obvious. Now that the centennial anniversary of Shelleys' death is at hand, attention will probably be directed once more to the women who played a part in his life—the pathetic farce of Elizabeth Hitchener, the tragedies of Harriet Westbrook and Fanny Imlay, the devotion of Mary Shelley, the curious platonic friendships with Jane Clairmont, Jane Williams, and Emilia Viviani. In such a company, although the poet's connection with her was posthumous, the name of Alma Murray (Mrs. Alfred Forman) should not go unregarded.

NEWMAN I. WHITE.

Trinity College, Durham, N. C.

RABELAIS,—A SOURCE FOR *GULLIVER'S TRAVELS*

For a long time the Rabelaisian element in *Gulliver* has been recognized, and a debt assumed. Sir Walter Scott pointed out, with perfect accuracy, that the occupations of the pedants in the Academy of Lagado, in the third voyage, are largely modelled upon Rabelais' account of the Abstractors in the Court of Queen Whim.[1] Further debt to Rabelais has been noted in the incident of Gulliver extinguishing the fire at the palace in Lilliput,[2] which resembles the joke played by Gargantua upon the Parisians. The parallel is first of all in the coarse situation (a giant urinating shamelessly in the presence of a crowd of pygmies); and secondly, in the devastation and wide-spread terror produced in each case by the flood.[3] Swift also seems to have a passage of Rabelais in mind, when he makes Gulliver comment on the shabby ancestry of the world's aristocracy that passes in review before his eyes in Glubdubdrib.[4] The satire in both accounts is the same, namely that popes and princes are, in reality, bred from a long line of pick-pockets and gamesters.

The above is a summary of the alleged borrowings, all of which have been commented upon by critics of *Gulliver*.[5] To these internal parallels I have nothing to add. So far, however, the debt has been inferred wholly from these parallels, which when examined, will be found inexact and unconvincing. May not Swift have copied some of the imitators of Rabelais, instead of

[1] Sir Walter Scott's edition of Swift, 1814, XI, 215-217 n., where he reprints Motteux' translation of Rabelais, Bk. V, ch. XXII.

[2] *Gulliver*, page 56; Rabelais, Bk. I, ch. XVII, page 70. All references to *Gulliver's Travels* are to the edition by G. R. Dennis, 1905; vol. VIII of *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, edited by Temple Scott. References to and quotations from Rabelais are based on the translation by Urquhart and Motteux, completed in 1708, the text with which Swift himself was probably familiar. I have used the reprint in *The Tudor Translations*, edited by W. E. Henley, 1900.

[3] Gulliver is banished from Lilliput, among other reasons, to prevent a recurrence of the disastrous flood. Compare also with similar situations in Rabelais, Bk. I, ch. XXXVI, page 126; Bk. I, ch. XXXVIII, page 132.

[4] *Gulliver*, page 208; Rabelais, Bk. I, ch. I, page 25.

[5] See the source studies by Hönncher and Borkowsky, in *Anglia*, X and XV.

Rabelais himself?[6] I shall here prove that Swift's mind was well stored with incidents from Rabelais, whose works he must have known almost by heart, since he was able to quote them off-hand in his correspondence, with verbal accuracy.

Not counting two vague references to Rabelais as a prevaricator and a satirist,[7] Swift four times quotes him directly. In one of his contributions to the *Examiner* there is the following:

"I likewise remember the story of a giant in *Rabelais*, who used to feed upon windmills, but was unfortunately choked with a small lump of butter before a warm oven."[8]

The allusion is to the following:

"For one Widenostrils, a huge giant . . . choaked himself with eating a huge lump of fresh butter at the mouth of a hot oven."[9]

In a letter to Bolingbroke, Swift writes,—

"The poor dead queen is used much like the giant Lougarou in Rabelais. Pantagruel took Lougarou by the heels, and made him his weapon to kill twenty other giants, then flung him over a river into the town and killed two ducks and an old cat."[10]

The original in Rabelais is as follows:

"He threw the body of Loupgarou, as hard as he could against the city, where falling like a frog upon his belly . . . he with the said fall killed a singed he-cat, a wet she-cat, a farting duck and a brideled goose."[11]

That Swift employed another story of Rabelais in some writing now lost is proved by the following statement of Bolingbroke in a letter to Swift:

"There never was a better application than yours of the story of Picrochole. The storks will never come, and they must be porters all their lives."[12]

---

[6] See especially the ridicule of learning in the *Amusements Serious and Comical*, by Tom Brown, 1704; as discussed by Professor Elbert N. S. Thompson, in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 1917, vol. 32, pp. 90-94.

[7] *Prose Works*, IX, 317; and X, 376.

[8] *Contributions to the Examiner*, No. 20. December, 1710.

[9] Rabelais, Bk. IV, ch. XVII, pages 102, 104.

[10] Letter to Bolingbroke, Sept. 14, 1714.

[11] Rabelais, Bk. II, ch. XXIX, page 319.

[12] Bolingbroke to Swift, March 17, 1718-19. The allusion is to Rabelais, Bk. I, ch. 49, page 162.

Finally, and most important of all, Swift alludes directly to one of the Abstractors of Queen Whim's court.

"For as to your scheme of raising one-hundred-and-ten-thousand pounds, it is as vain as that of Rabelais, which was to squeeze out wind from the posteriors of a dead ass." [13]

Not only is this last a correct quotation from Rabelais, but it will be recognized as an accurate statement of the experiment performed by the physician whom Gulliver visits in Lagado; except that the latter applies the bellows to a dog instead of to an ass.[14]

Swift knew the works of Rabelais. He quoted the latter's ridicule of scientific projectors, and reproduced it in *Gulliver's Travels.* I believe we may conclude with reason that, in writing *Gulliver's Travels,* Swift borrowed hints directly from Rabelais.

WILLIAM A. EDDY.

Princeton University.

REVIEWS

Beowulf, an Introduction to the Study of the Poem with a Discussion of the Stories of Offa and Finn. By R. W. CHAMBERS. Cambridge: University Press, 1921. Pp. xii + 417.

The time is almost ripe for the compilation of a *Beowulf* variorum. Such, however, is not the task that Professor Chambers has set for himself in this masterly volume, although, when one does appear, his contributions will bulk large in its pages. If any fault is found with the present study, it is likely to be that he does not here supply a complete historical outline of scholarship concerning the poem; for so much is included that students will wish there had been even more. The book is divided into four parts:—the first covering three chapters, which deal, respectively with the Historical Elements, the Non-Historical Elements, and Theories as to the Origin, Date, and Structure of the Poem; the second presenting the Documents Illustrating the Stories in Beowulf and

[13] *Prose Works,* VII,, 114. *An Answer to a Paper Called, "A Memorial of the Poor Inhabitants of Ireland."*

[14] Rabelais, Bk. V, ch. XXII, page 310; *Gulliver,* 189.

the Offa Saga; the third devoted to the Fight at Finnsburg; and the fourth giving the substantial Appendix, with more detailed argument concerning questions raised in the preceding pages, like those of the mythology in the poem, the evidence for the date, archeological material, and the folk tale of the bear's son. A full Bibliography and Index are added. Plates afford some of the Nero Ms. illustrations for the Offa saga, a sketch of Leire in the seventeenth century, and pictures of the Gokstad and Oseberg ships. It is a wholly dignified piece of work, and a worthy successor to the volume containing the text.

For the student the meat of the matter is found in parts one and three. Something of the method is perhaps revealed by the fact that these occupy one hundred and seventy-three pages in proportion to two hundred and eight of illustrative documents and the subsidiary questions in the Appendix. Nothing is omitted, unless we quarrel with the author for passing over the Irish parallels, or the myths of Castor and Pollux and of Wayland. The arguments are in general distinguished for fairness and clarity. Yet the student, for whom this serves as an introduction, may protest that owing to the scattering of material some theories, like that of Müllenhoff, fail to have a fair chance (material related to the Müllenhoff argument, to which the Index does not give full reference, appears on pp. 42, 46, 68, 89, 112, and 292 ff.)[1] The account of the various mythological interpretations, omitting, by the way, reference (pp. 46-47) to Simrock and Sarrazin and to the full development of the opposition (as in Heinzel, *Anz. f. d. Alt.* XVI, 264 ff. and in Gering's introduction to his translation), may be found cursory. The study is systematic; but the student may be bothered by an omission, here and there, of full documentation: p. 17, ref. to the date of the mounds; p. 24, ref. to Scandinavian sources and to Saxo; p. 38, ref. to a letter of Alcuin; p. 272, ref. to Siebs. One could wish that references to Axel Olrik were, where possible, rather to the translated form of the study, now accessible with some changes from the original, although some of the material in it is cited (as p. 333, n. 1).

[1] Similarly the details important for a study of Beowulf's name appear on pp. 56 and note 2 (reference is omitted to Sarrazin's equation of Bothvar and Beowulf, *Anglia* IX, 198 ff., opposed by Bugge), 291 and note, 296, 310, 365 ff. (the Index refers only to the last).

Sometimes allusions are cleared by a search in Part Two; but a little more machinery would have made the book easier to use. The beginner may be hampered because older theories are sometimes only mentioned, although, where an older theory has, in his opinion, been wrongfully neglected (cf. p. 45), Professor Chambers dwells on it. None of these points are very important, except to show that the book is not an Introduction at all, except as the prolegomena for an expert, but a contribution.

From this point of view the material offered by Professor Chambers himself challenges criticism, and will furnish a new basis for investigation. He gives what seems to be the most credible interpretation so far offered of the facts about Grendel and Sceaf and the Geats,[2] about the date of the poem (where he inclines, rightly I think, to the skepticism of Chadwick and Tupper in regard to the present linguistic tests), and about the Christian elements. It is, of course, inevitable that he should lean heavily upon the work of predecessors, and to them much credit is due which even a vast array of footnotes could hardly make clear. But these sections are excellent, and, as far as such discussions may, should stand as final.

While probably subject to revision in details the study of the historical background is thoroughly well managed. Only rarely, as perhaps in the section devoted to the Heathobeardan, does he fail to do his opponents full justice. On this subject Olrik (*Heroic Legends,* pp. 305 ff.), giving a careful analysis of the development of the legend, urged that the Danish traditions about Healfdene and Frothi were not likely to be less dependable than the Norse, and that the natural inference from the *Beowulf* supports the Danish; to which Chambers only responds that the Norse seems "much more probable."[3] The study of Offa is careful, but one could wish for more than one analogue of the story of the "wild maiden"; and in the discussion the parallel

[2] Cf. H. G. Leach, *Angevin Britain and Scandinavia,* Cambridge, 1921, pp. 295-8.

[3] Olrik's attempt to read the account of this matter in the *Beowulf* (see Chambers, p. 21, n. 3) as a narrative of past events was satisfactorily disposed of by Lawrence (*P. M. L. A.* xxx, p. 380; cf. *Heroic Legends,* p. 20). The place of Hrothulf in the court (see Chambers, p. 25) is made clear by Olrik (*Heroic Legends,* p. 55, note, quoting Klaeber).

between Offa I and the figure in the *Beowulf* is lost sight of. Apparently we are to infer that the "wild maiden" was first attached to Offa I, then that both were reflected in the poem, and finally that Offa II inherited the story. An interesting feature is that the rudderless boat becomes attached to the story of Cynethryth.

Perhaps the most interesting point that becomes clear in this part of the study, however, is that either the figure of Beowulf has replaced someone from actual history,—and everything is against the assumption,—or the weaving of fact and fiction in the poem has been done with almost superhuman skill. Here we have a long account of a great family drawn from history, whose court is rescued from disaster by the hero, supposedly related to another great family, which is also taken from true history. We thus have links with history through the stories of Hrothgar, and of Hrothulf and Hrethric, through the royal house at Leire, and also through Hygelac (on whose expedition Beowulf went, where he showed his prowess in the swimming exploit,—notice the contact here of history and legend). The lays, moreover, introduce facts of historical narrative. The method by which the insertion of the story is made is a lesson in art; and this should be, when it is established, the most important concern in studying the background of the poem. Notice some of the other links: Beowulf is taken as a son by Hrothgar; is entertained with the lay of Finnsburg; is asked to be friendly to Hrothgar's son (ll. 1226-7, cf. ll. 1836-8); receives the arms of Hrothgar which should have gone to Heoroward (cf. Chambers, p. 29); prophesies the story of Ingeld; supports Eadgils in an invasion of Sweden; etc. Even granting the weak points noted by Chambers (pp. 10-13), and also the parallel in some details to Bothvar Bjarki (pp. 12, 55, 60), the way in which a preposterous story is here closely and precisely set in a background of historic fact must seem to everybody a remarkable achievement. The suggestion also follows that the gain in reality was intended for an audience well acquainted with all these historical details, which were hardly the property of the folk tale.[4]

[4] The artistic use of the details suggests that the process happened pretty much at one time. If it did not, why was so much material, which was intimately concerned with the same families, added at different periods?

In the discussion of the non-historical elements the original contribution is rich with detail. Some students will wish that the Breca episode (with its analogues) had been included, certainly with some justice in view of its relation to Müllenhoff's theories. Others may question why no reference is made to the story of Siward of Northumberland, or to the romance of Eger and Grime; or why a fuller study of the dragon-episode (with reference to Panzer, *Beowulf,* pp. 293 ff.) was not introduced, with some analysis of the problem debated by Lawrence (*P.M.L.A.* XXXIII, 547 ff.) and Hubbard ("The Plundering of the Hoard," *Wisconsin Studies,* Madison, 1920). With only one example of the *Beowulf* type, the dragon seems rather slighted. The types seem to overlap a little; and one cannot help wondering whether, if the dragon story had actually belonged to Frotho earlier and had been later attached to the *Beowulf* at its present point, it would not have automatically assumed the features which Chambers assigns to the second variety, since it was Beowulf's way to go to the defense of other people when he was seeking renown. (Is this latter a point which commended the story to the Christian poet?) Professor Chambers reaffirms, without defining, the relation of the story with the *Grettis saga* and the Saga of Bothvar Bjarki. In my opinion he hardly does justice to the parallel with the story of Orm, where we find that the cat (giantess) is the mother of Brusi; where Asbiorn may be equated with Aeschere; and where the cry of the monster was taken for that of Orm. (No mention is made of these points, and the ballads are not quoted. Cf. Panzer, pp. 344 ff.). In the *Grettis saga* any relation between Glam or the giant and the troll-wife is not indicated.[5] We may note that while Grendel in English tradition represents a water-spirit (cf. Chambers, p. 307), this feature is not characteristic of the story of the bear's son, nor of the Scandinavian analogues except that of Grettir; neither is that of the arm torn from its socket.[6] Both of these, however, are

[5] With the details of the fight with Glam, cf. the fight with the Howe-dweller and that with the bear. In the latter Grettir cuts off the bear's paw. Note Biarco's fight with a bear in Saxo, Chambers, p. 57, and cf. the detail in the bear story, Chambers, p. 375.

[6] For which reference should be made to Kittredge, *Arthur and Gorlagon,* [Harvard] Studies and Notes, VIII, pp. 223 ff. In the story of the bear's son the approach to the demon's abode is sometimes down a well: see Panzer, p. 116.

familiar in Irish lore, to which Chambers pays scant respect, and which, of course, may be due there in part to the Teutonic story (cf. Zimmer, *Z. f. d. A.* XXXII, p. 332).

The most debatable position taken by Chambers in the book is that in regard to the Finnsburg story. In substance it is an expansion of the statement already given in his edition of the *Beowulf*, which, according to Lawrence (*P. M. L. A.* XXX, 431; cf. Ayres, *J. E. G. P.* XVI, p. 282, n. 1) was "to be decidedly rejected, as lacking evidence in the text, and indeed as being contradicted by it.". Chambers seems to underestimate (pp. 275 ff.) the value of the Scandinavian parallels cited by Lawrence, and, to make his theory fit, is forced into a somewhat labored argument in the attempt to exonerate Finn. It is hard to get away from the words of the poet that some reproach may be found in the situation when Hengest's men "hira bēaȝ-ȝyfan banan folȝedon."[7] The explanation of the Eotens, drawn partly from Siebs and Lawrence (cf. *P. M. L. A.* XXX, 393 ff.), is plausible, especially if we agree that the Geats cannot be Jutish; yet Chambers has to go outside the text to discover why Finn should back up this strange tribe when they attack the kinsfolk of his wife.[8] Why does Finn's son join the attack? (That he does so is pure conjecture.) Why is not the revenge attack directed against the Eotens, who, obviously, are not the only ones to feel the edges of

[7] They are bound to spend the winter at Finnsburg because they are only a "wēa-lāf" (cf. Brown, *M. L. N.* XXXIV, p. 183; Moore, *J. E. G. P.* XVIII, 208 ff.) and because they cannot put to sea (ll. 1130-3). In any case, even if Finn was not personally responsible for the killing of Hnæf, he had supported the tribe that attacked the Danes.

[8] Chambers' interpretation of "þā hīe se fǣr begeat" (p. 263) seems to be that it refers necessarily to the opening of the feud, and that Finn receives an attack in which, observe, *he is expected to join or does join* (cf. p. 284; later he is held in some way responsible for the death of Hnæf.) That this reading is very doubtful we may conclude from Chambers' own remark, that certainly "the unexpected attack must have come not upon the assailants but upon the assailed"! Note especially the suggested translation (Wyatt and Chambers, *Beowulf*, p. 55, note on l. 1068): "At the hands of the children of Finn . . . the hero of the Healfdene, Hnæf, was doomed to fall." Insert "when they were attacked" after the words "of Finn," and notice the logic of the whole statement. If anything in the episode is dark, this would be darker! Who are the "children of Finn"? The Eotens (the assailants), or Finn's own men (here, therefore, accused of attacking Hnæf)?

the hostile swords?[9] The clear force of the story seems dissipated a little if Finn is not really responsible for the tragedy; if the revenge is Hunlafing's.[10] When a new theory is offered to replace an old one for the explanation of a text, it should depend rather less than the earlier upon mere conjecture. Professor Chambers has close reasoning powers, a strong imagination for a good story, and wide learning: an almost fatal combination in a scholar. But his account fails to satisfy at least one of the valid requirements; it does not tell us why the episode appears in the poem.

That leads me to observe that the section on "the Structure" of the poem is the weakest. There we should have liked to see fuller discussion of theories like those of Earle (on the gnomic passages), Hart, Chadwick (the *Heroic Age*), and Sarrazin (on the authorship). Incidentally the use of lays in the poem would have received attention. Here I have room only to note that external allusions in the *Beowulf* always seem to have some point: the reference to Sigmund ironically foreshadows the fight with the dragon. So, as Lawrence seems to suggest, the story of the failure of Hildeburh as a peace-weaver seems related to the fate of Freawaru,[11] and this situation implies some kind of hostility

[9] *Beowulf*, ll. 1146 ff. Note also how much Finn's men suffered in the first fight, ll. 1079 ff.

[10] Chambers urges, p. 285, "It is possible that the young prince's father, Hunlaf, was slain then. . . . Perhaps [Hengest] so far respects his oath that he leaves the simultaneous attack upon Finn to Guthlaf and Oslaf." Hengest thus drops from the center of things while he devotes his attention to a subordinate tribe. Notice the conjectures! According to Olrik "Hunlafing" may be simply the name of Hunlaf's sword (*Heroic Legends*, pp. 145 ff.; cf. Chambers, p. 252, n. 2, and Lawrence, *P. M. L. A.* xxx, 423 ff., which might well have been cited by Chambers). Chambers adds to his conjectures on p. 247 to explain the fact that Guthlaf, the father, is in the hall and Garulf, the son, is outside: "Father and son may have been separated through earlier misadventures, and now find themselves engaged on opposite sides." Cf. Lawrence, *op. cit.*, 425 ff.

[11] When the lay is sung, Wealhtheow proceeds at once to where Hrothgar and Hrothulf are sitting, "suhter-ȝefæderan" (ll. 1162-1164), whose cordial relation at this time may be emphasized in this way (cf. *Widsith* ll. 45-49) because it endured at least until the defense against Ingeld. Wealhtheow herself is a peace-weaver. Cf. Olrik, *Heroic Legends*, p. 498; note the part played by Unferth in the story of Hrothulf, and see the immediate reference, ll. 1165-67.

between Finn and the Hocings which would lead to the episode, and which would explain not only Finn's attitude but the character of the return attack. If Finn is guiltless, then the whole story is as much the tragedy of Finn as of Hengest: Finn is brought into it because his son has voluntarily entered the brawl and has suffered in consequence; he wins the reputation of being responsible for the death of his brother-in-law; his men are reduced; and eventually he is slain, his queen carried off, and his court sacked. Is this the Danish tragedy that we are meant to infer from the *Beowulf?*

But it is tempting to disagree with Professor Chambers, for he is so steadily gracious to his opponents. In general his argument is more than acceptable; and obviously most of my strictures are based on a question of his policy.

Some further notes on smaller items may be added for what they are worth. The Bibliography is excellent, but some minor suggestions for it are as follows:—p. 387, § 3, add 1921, Rypins, *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer.* XXXVI, 167-185; p. 389, 1903, Trautmann, Finn u. Hildebrand,—items like this, I think, should be referred to under § 8 for the discussion; p. 394, add 1920, Thomas, W., Beowulf et les premiers fragments épiques anglo-saxons, étude critique et traduction, Paris, Didier; p. 397, add 1915, Classen, E., O. E. 'Nicras' ('Beowulf' 422, 575, 845, 1427), *M. L. R.* X, 85 ff.; p. 403, add 1899, Bugge, The Home of the Eddic Poems, trans. Schofield, Grimm Lib.; p. 404, Klaeber, Hrothulf, *M. L. N.* XX, 9-11 (see, however, Chambers, p. 396); p. 408, the trade edition of Olson's "The Relation of the Hrólfs Saga Kraka" etc. was issued as a publication of the Society for the Advancement of Scandinavian Study, Urbana, Illinois; p. 408, add 1916, Green, A., The Opening of the Episode of Finn in "Beowulf," *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer.* XXXI, 759-797 (see Chambers, p. 263, n. 3); p. 411, add 1920, Liebermann, F., Ort und Zeit der Beowulfdichtung, *Nachrichten der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, Phil.-Histor. Kl.* 255-276; 1920, Holthausen, F., Ein lappisches Bärensohn-Märchen, *Anglia Beibl.* XXXI, 66-7; 1920, Aurner, N. S., Hengest, a study in early English hero legend, *Univ. of Iowa Studies,* II, 1; Nader, Zur Syntax des Béowulf, was, I think, continued in 1880 and 1882; p. 412, Kraucl's diss., 1908, is announced for Morsbach's *Studien;*

p. 413, Leonard's "Beowulf and the Niebelungen Couplet" is reviewed by Klaeber, *Anglia Beiblatt,* XXXII, 145 ff. One could wish that the Index were fuller, to include at least more references to scholars in the field (e. g., Olrik, Sievers, Sarrazin) especially when their theories are discussed at length.

On the body of the discussion I have the following notes:—P. 6, "'in a chill journey'"—taking *cealdum* as a ref. to the battle on the ice seems to me absurd; Chambers (*Beowulf,* p. 120) suggests "bitter, hostile," but, as Gummere points out (*Oldest Eng. Epic,* p. 125, n. 2), it is "the technical adjective for exile." In Middle English the word means "baneful." P. 8, for theories as to the early history of the Swedish royal house, see also Chambers, *Widsith,* p. 200, n. 31. P. 9, Gregory's use of "Dane" resembles that of the early English. P. 11, the extravagant element about Beowulf's deeds does not tell necessarily against his being "a historic Geatish king": one may compare the stories of Charlemagne and Arthur (according to Nennius Arthur killed nine hundred and sixty men in one day) or even that of Grettir! The thirty suits of armor may be only "the additional touch which legend always gives to history" (Gummere, *op. cit.,* p. 124, n. 1.). P. 13, the choice of Wiglaf is explained in the poem ll. 2813-14; the dragon-episode simply augurs well for the valor of the youth (a point, by the way, recalling Frotho). P. 18, the Roskilde problem is discussed by Olrik, *Heroic Legends,* p. 295, n. P. 20, n. 1, see also Olrik, pp. 336, 340 and note. P. 27, for Unferth, cf. Olrik, pp. 63 ff., and for his function see an interesting discussion by B. S. Phillpotts, *The Elder Edda and Ancient Scandinavian Drama,* Cambridge, 1920, 181 ff. P. 30, the *Bjarkamál* is also extant in six scattered stanzas,—cf. Olrik, pp. 87 and 90 ff. P. 58, the Bjarki parallel,—reference should be added to Olrik (with the note on Olson's analysis) pp. 247 ff. P. 63, the explanation for the confident sleep of the men is given ll. 705-7. P. 64, the reason that Beowulf allows one death is that he cannot help it. This is no common foe; presumably the hall is dark; and Beowulf must observe how the monster goes to work (ll. 736-8). P. 75, the problem of Sceaf is discussed by Olrik, pp. 389 ff. P. 84, cf. Belden, *M. L. N.* XXXIII, 315. P. 88, on the nature-myth, the problem of Yng is important, discussed by Olrik and others; cf. *A. f. n. F.* XXXI, p. 153. P. 93, cf. Lawrence, *P. M. L. A.,* XXXIII, 548, n. 1, on the

parallels. P. 106, citing *Guthlac* A as c. 750 is now dangerous in view of Gerould's article, *M. L. N.* XXXII, 77 ff. On the other hand, Chambers seems almost too cautious in returning to the doubts of Sievers about the *Fata*. P. 112, in my opinion some of the best material about the date of the poem has been put into the Appendix (see p. 329). P. 125, if the passages were rewritten to give Christian coloring, we should expect *more* rather than less. P. 127, one of the best passages is Christian (where Hrothgar thanks Beowulf, ll. 942-946). To this section may now be added, Emerson, "Grendel's Motive in Attacking Heorot," *M. L. R.* XVI, 113 ff. P. 253, one could wish for a note on "the placing of the sword in the bosom of another." Cf. B. C. Williams, *Gnomic Poetry in Anglo-Saxon*, N. Y., 1914, p. 149 on the Cotton verse. P. 265, note 2, for "Carlton" read "Carleton." Add Moore, *J. E. G. P.* XVIII, 208 ff. P. 267, n. 3, can't we assume that the story was sufficiently well known for Ayres's interpretation to hold good—cf. the difficulty in regard to "þā hīe se fær bejeat"? P. 272, don't overlook the point that Finn is called "hira beaj-jyfan bana." P. 275, the allusion to the Atli parallel is not made with Chambers' customary fairness, and the argument here clouds the issue. P. 323, wouldn't the dates of the charters bearing Grendel's name be pertinent? P. 327, I think that Chambers here underestimates the interest in the Danes all through the poem. Pp. 352-3, the argument here seems to me less cogent than usual, although the point may be well taken. The *Andreas* notoriously borrows from the *Beowulf* (cf. Krapp's ed., p. lv), while there is no reason to suppose that in such matters the *Beowulf* is indebted to any literary source. What of the monsters of the Grendel type in Scandinavian finds, and the boar-helmets? (If only one example has been found, how do we know that it is characteristically Anglo-Saxon? In fact, how do we know that it isn't Danish?) P. 361, what about the bowers which the men so hastily sought in order not to be exposed to Grendel? P. 367, the danger of the effect of popular etymology in "bee-wolf" is perilously close.

HOWARD R. PATCH.

Smith College.

L'Esprit de Renan, by PIERRE GUILLOUX. Paris: J. de Gigord, 1921. 412 pp.

Ernest Renan, by LEWIS FREEMAN MOTT. New York: Appleton, 1921. vi + 462 pp.

Ernest Renan, der Dichter und der Künstler, by WALTHER KÜCHLER. Gotha: 1921. 213 pp.

Altho the centennial of Renan's birth has passed almost unnoticed, three recently published works point to the fact that an interest in the author of *la Vie de Jésus* and in his influence has not entirely disappeared. In *l'Esprit de Renan* Pierre Guilloux, with the *imprimatur* of the Church, renews the attack upon "cet écrivain si ensorcelant et si disputé," upon the founder of that pernicious Renanism or Dilettantism, upon the renegade from Saint-Sulpice who is recognized with Bayle and Voltaire as "l'un des adversaires les plus acharnés et les plus perfides du christianisme." The malicious sophistry of Guilloux and his bitter, controversial tone recall Biré and Parigot. The student of Renan might well ignore, of course, *l'Esprit de Renan,* were it not that the spirit and the influence of this *prêtre manqué* seem to his old adversaries so persistent and so powerful thirty years after his death. Guilloux finds consolation, however, in regarding *le Voyage du Centurion,* by Renan's grand-son, as an expiation for *les Origines du Christianisme.*

Professor L. F. Mott's recent biography of Renan supersedes all previous works in English. First of all, Mott has made excellent use of the large amount of new material which the earlier biographers did not have at their disposal. The publication of *Cahiers de Jeunesse, Nouveaux Cahiers de Jeunesse,* and *Fragments intimes et romanesques,* has given us a clearer comprehension not only of *Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse* but of much of Renan's earlier work, especially *l'Avenir de la Science.* Secondly, a temporal and geographical remoteness has enabled Mott to attain much greater impartiality than his predecessors. Both Mary Robinson and Grant Duff have written of Renan in the somewhat indulgent and reminiscent mood of personal friends, while William Barry saw in Renan not much more than a striking contrast to Newman, whose conversion so providentially occurred almost contemporaneously with Renan's withdrawal from the

Church. Parigot's enmity seemed almost personal and even Séailles found it difficult to do full justice to Renan.

"It has not been the purpose of this study to defend Renan or even to propagate any of his ideas . . . but to exhibit the intimate relationship of his work to his life." In carrying out this purpose Mott has quite rightly laid more stress than his predecessors upon the importance of *l'Avenir de la Science* in which he finds all that is fundamental in Renan. He has shown in a very satisfactory manner the identity of thought and point of view in the *Notebooks* and *l'Avenir de la Science.* He sees in Renan, not what so many have pointed out, an accumulation of incongruities and contradictions, but rather "the unity of a fine life."

Mott has not, however, found anything really new to add to our knowledge or comprehension of the author of *Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse,* which work still stands, as far as essentials are concerned, the best of the biographies of Renan. He has with great care and patience added the details, especially those concerning minor and unimportant events, but has not assisted us in that broader study of the intellectual and philosophic background and environment of the friend of Taine and Berthelot. He has placed too little emphasis upon the various French influences which were exerted upon Renan and has minimized the importance of Herder and Hegel.

He abuses the privilege of quotation. While one may agree with Anatole France that "les citations bien prises" constitute in many cases an adequate criticism, one questions the wisdom of such extensive citation. As Mott states, Renan is inexhaustibly rich in *obiter dicta,* but that hardly justifies so many pages of random quotation, which even in Mott's excellent translation lose much of their original flavor. He inadvertently ascribes to La Rochefoucauld rather than to Montesquieu the remark about never having had a "chagrin qu'une heure de lecture ne m'ait ôté."

In *Ernest Renan, der Dichter und der Künstler,* Professor Walther Küchler has given us an interesting study of Renan, whom he considers "die blendendste Erscheinung unter den französischen Schriftstellern der zweiten Hälfte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts." He has paid special attention to the poetic and artistic aspirations of the young Renan, the Renan of the *Fragments intimes et romanesques.* The poet whom we all have within us

but who dies young, according to Sainte-Beuve, lived on with Renan in the scholar and the historian. The enthusiastic young student of the *Notebooks* was also trying his hand at verse, which we find in the *Fragments,* and attempting a novel in *Patrice.* It was the poet who wrote the descriptions in *la Vie de Jésus* and, if, in later life, the poetic faculties were somewhat dormant during the work on the *Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum,* they reappear again in full vigor in what Matthew Arnold with true Anglo-Saxon indignation denounced as a "monument of lubricity," *l'Abbesse de Jouarre.* Küchler's analysis of his genuinely poetic and artistic nature must be considered as a real contribution to the study of Renan. While he has not had the advantage of any new material, he has made full use of what other scholars have also possessed and has succeeded in throwing new light upon the character and nature of Renan. It is quite possible that the latter's manuscripts and literary papers, deposited at the Bibliothèque Nationale, may, when they become accessible to the public, furnish Küchler with much more material.

Certain of his chapters deserve special mention. He has, for example, given us a most intelligent and detailed discussion of Renan's early studies in German, especially his reading in German literature, and has also carefully reviewed Renan's later attitude toward German thought in general. He has shown us the effect of Italy upon Renan at the time of his first visit; altho Rome meant something quite different to Goethe, yet in the case of both Goethe and Renan there occurred a profound change under the influence of Italy. The judgments of the younger Renan on French literature in general have been analysed with the skill and discernment of one who has his subject well in hand. One cannot but regret that Küchler has been unable, as he states in his preface, to continue his study of Renan in a second volume, which would have dealt with the influence of Renan upon contemporary thought.

The more important portions of his volume have already appeared in a slightly different form in *Die Neueren Sprachen* and *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur.* The chapters added to the original articles possess much less value and in some cases show signs of too much haste in preparation. Both Mme Duclaux and "René d'Ys" should have prevented Küchler from falling into the error of the *Souvenirs* as to the date of Renan's

birth and a verification of the quotation in the preface to *Le Prêtre de Némi* would have avoided the reference to Strabo as a "lateinischer Historiker."

The book is now published in a series entitled "Brücken" and unquestionably Renan has given us the safest 'bridge' with the most secure foundations for the mutual understanding of France and Germany. Renan, however, exhibited far more discrimination and critical acumen than did the author of *De l'Allemagne* and Küchler should not have passed over in silence Gabriel Brunet's article (*Mercure de France,* 1er août, 1919), entitled *Renan et l'Allemagne,* where a slightly different emphasis is placed upon the question. The truth, of course, lies, as Renan so often said, somewhere between the positive and the negative and so in this case somewhere between Küchler and Brunet.

James F. Mason.

Cornell University.

A Book of German Lyrics, selected and edited with Notes and Vocabulary by Friedrich Bruns, Assistant Professor of German, University of Wisconsin. xi + 194 pp. New York, D. C. Heath & Co., 1921.

The title seems misleading in that a number of narrative poems are included. Thus Schiller is represented by *Die Kraniche des Ibykus* and *Das verschleierte Bild zu Sais.*

The selections comprise the work of fourteen poets, reaching from Goethe to Liliencron. Considering the limitations imposed, there can, on the whole, be no quarrel with the choice of authors: one is even inclined to concede the inclusion of Rückert in this small, select group on the basis of his 'Aus der Jugendzeit, aus der Jugendzeit,' dangerous as such a principle of a single outstanding poem might otherwise prove.

As to emphasis, judged by the space allowed them, these writers fall into three groups, the first being made up of Goethe, Heine, Schiller, and Uhland; the last of Platen, Keller, and Rückert. The balance is just, except possibly in the case of Keller, whose fifty-two lines hardly do him justice, as to either quantity or quality, or bear out the remark of the Preface that "Geibel, Wilhelm

Müller and Bodenstedt have given way to Mörike, Keller and Hebbel."

The most striking quality of the book is its air of directness and immediateness. There is no general Introduction, germane matter being assigned to the place where it is most readily found, the Notes. The comments on the individual poems are preceded by biographical and critical sketches of the authors, varying from a full page or more anent C. F. Meyer, Goethe, and Schiller, to a bare eight lines in the case of Rückert. These differ greatly in merit: to take the two Swiss, the sketch of Keller is wholly perfunctory, that of Meyer brilliant.

Reproductions of paintings by Böcklin (3), Moritz von Schwind (3), and Feuerbach (1) accompany the text. Special effectiveness cannot be claimed for them. The "Schemen" and "luftige Wesen" of Meyer's *Liederseelen* are not mirrored in Schwind's *Elfenreigen,* any more than Hebbel's *Sommerbild* is congruous with Böcklin's *Vita Somnium Breve.* For the latter the coloring is in any case an indispensable element. Again, Böcklin's *Schweigen im Walde,* otherwise very effective, is misplaced: its milieu is Eichendorff, not Heine. Apart from other considerations, it may perhaps be mentioned that the unicorn is the symbol of chastity.

Much care has been bestowed upon things metrical. Three pages are devoted to an outline of the Elements of Versification,[1] and differences in rhythm are constantly referred to in the comment proper. In many cases such observations are genuinely illuminating. However, if there were need of another reminder of the subjective nature of all metrics, the purpose might well be subserved by the note on Platen's *Das Grab im Busento:* "Notice the stately dignity of the long trochaic line without any marked caesural pause. Any attempt to introduce the latter spoils the majestic ring of the verse." The reviewer will continue to read

[1] The chief objection to be urged against this presentation is the use of the hybrid symbols ˣ and –. In the list of basic feet, adjective and noun are confused in one instance. Under the impure rimes—*i. e.* rounded and unrounded vowel—*ei* and *äu* should have been listed, occurring as they do in three of the four opening poems of the collection. The Nibelungen stanza is not *ohne weiteres* identical with the meter of Heine's 'Du bist wie eine Blume'; the effect is wholly different, the one being dipodic, the other monopodic, a distinction, by the way, that the editor has nowhere made use of.

the poem with a fixed, strongly marked caesura in the middle of the line and take comfort in the fact that seven of the ten marks of punctuation used in the middle of the line coincide with this caesural pause. Failure to call attention to a caesural pause might justly be charged against the treatment of No. 99. Under the head of the sonnet the statement concerning the arrangement of the rimes in the tercets is too dogmatic. Nor can it be maintained that in Rückert's 'Aus der Jugendzeit' the fourth line of each stanza "must be read with three accents."

In the following comments on the Notes no cognizance is taken of matter that the editor has designedly excluded. They are offered as contributions to a revised edition.

The note on l. 103 of *Die Kraniche des Ibykus* evinces a curious misconception of Schiller's lines, which depict the appeal to the imagination of the audience, not an intellectual weighing pro and con.—In l. 10 of *Die Grenadiere, wohl* is not *indeed* but the "ballad" *wohl,* which occurs several times in the collection and might have deserved a connected treatment.—The word "preceding" in the note to No. 50 refers to No. 48.—The tone of No. 54 shows that Heine means to emphasize the serio-comic side of the situation.—The implication in No. 57 is surely that the *Bett* is the grave in which the poet is soon to lie.—No. 58 can be better understood when it is stated that it formed the conclusion of the cycle *Die Heimkehr.—Husch,* p. 77, l. 47, is, of course, not *Hush!* or *'sh!* but represents the suddenness of the crumbling of the skeleton. A somewhat similar use will be found in Bürger's *Lenore.*—In connection with No. 111 a reference to *Immensee* seems indispensable.—In No. 123 the *Old* Dutch, or Flemish, school of painting (Rubens) is meant.—If the plurals *Firnen* (p. 106, l. 19 and p. 107, l. 12) are not misprints, the form should be recognized in the Vocabulary.—In No. 130 the sphere of *flirren* is that of color and light, not of vibration.—An English equivalent of *sirren* in No. 131, l. 9, is *swish* (*the swish of*).—No. 133, l. 16: Bevern is not the name of the little Brunswick town but of the distinguished Prussian general who fought at Kolin, or rather of his regiment.—In No. 138 the significance of *Myrtenkränze* (*bridal wreaths*) is not indicated in the Notes. The Vocabulary omits the word as a self-explanatory compound.

The printing has been done with care and errors are few. In

No. 31, l. 6, *wenn* should be *wann*. Letters have been dropped in No. 31, l. 1 and No. 40, l. 1. No. 125 should have been printed as two stanzas, not one. At the end of the first line of p. 17 there should be a comma instead of a period.

B. J. Vos.

Indiana University.

Écrivains français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVIIe siècle. By Gustave Cohen. Paris: Champion, 1920. Pp. 756.

This dissertation makes an important contribution to the study of French influence abroad. M. Cohen has carried on most extensive researches in Holland, utilizing particularly the recently published sources for the history of the University of Leyden, and has brought out clearly that long before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes French ideas were entering Holland through the presence there of French writers belonging to various professions and by no means exclusively calvinistic. He first discusses Jean de Schelandre, a soldier-poet, known as the author of *Tyr et Sidon*. The documents he has discovered concern rather his older brother Robert, captain in the service of the United Provinces, but it is reasonable to accept the statement of Colletet that Jean also took part in the war. This gives M. Cohen an opportunity not only to study in detail the poems of Schelandre that have to do with the conflict between the Dutch and the Spaniards, but also to describe the life of French mercenaries in the Low Countries during the early part of the century.

The second division of the work is devoted to scholars and students who went from France to the University of Leyden. From its foundation this institution was a center of propagation of French ideas. Two of its original faculty of eight were Frenchmen. Among its distinguished professors were, in theology, Daneau, Du Jon, Rivet; in law, Doneau; in philology, J. J. Scaliger and Claude Saumaize.[1] The direction of its garden was confided to a French botanist. Among its many French students were

[1] The two last were under no obligation to teach. A similar arrangement has been recently made at the University of Michigan and called an experiment in education.

J. L. Guez de Balzac and Théophile de Viau.[2] It is in this part of the book that M. Cohen makes his chief contribution to the subject he treats. The sketches he gives of various personalities, of Clusius and Saumaize, for instance, are thoroughly interesting, as are his descriptions of university manners.

The third and largest division concerns Descartes. Here there is little that is new apart from the publication of the contract for printing the *Discours de la méthode* and a power of attorney signed by Descartes in 1641. M. Cohen frankly admits that he has not added much to the monumental *Œuvres de Descartes* of MM. Adam and Tannery, but he makes the plea that the latter work, on account of its size, is largely inaccessible to the general public and to many scholars. This explanation would justify a brief résumé of the older treatise, but not the 329 pages which M. Cohen devotes to the task, unless his readers, unlike Descartes, suffer from "la superstition du volume dans tous les sens du mot" (p. 311).

But while a shorter book would have been more effective, even more scholarly, one must not disregard it because one-half of it contains much that is not new. It gives the only general account in existence of the subject treated and must be consulted for information about many individual authors.[3] An extensive index of proper names, so often unfortunately lacking in dissertations, adds much to its usefulness. As *pièces justificatives* two long poems by Schelandre and the plan of his epic, the *Stuartide*, have been reproduced, also the *Discours politique* of J. L. G. de Balzac. The book is well printed and handsomely illustrated. Among the portraits are five of Descartes, one of them a first draft of Frans Hals's famous painting. A sequel, which brings the study of French writers in Holland down to the end of the seventeenth century, is now in preparation and will be awaited with interest.

H. Carrington Lancaster.

[2] M. Cohen thinks it possible that both of them may have gone to Holland two or three years before their matriculation in 1615.

[3] The only omission I note is that of Jean d'Espagne, who once lived in Holland and who published theological treatises there in 1639 and 1640. On pages 302, 303 M. Cohen makes a startling excursion into American geography. The Pilgrim Fathers, it seems, "débarquent dans la baie d'Hudson(!), au cap Cod et y(!) bâtissent New-Plymouth."

CORRESPONDENCE

Two Eighteenth-Century Emendations to *Chevy Chase*

In the *Memoirs of the Society of Grub-Street* (London, 1737), which is an incomplete reprint of the *Grub-Street Journal,* are two notes on the text of Chevy Chase. The first is headed "From the Pegasus in Grub-Street," and is printed in the number for Wednesday, 17 November, 1731.[1] The lines quoted from the ballad follow the C, D, and E versions in Child. It should be noted that the emended line, "when they were cold as clay," is the reading of the Child F version, the one printed by Maidment. In earlier pages of the *Memoirs* appear emendations to *Paradise Lost,* signed with the same name, "Zoilus," that is used for the signature for the ballad note. The entire communication reads:

Mr. Bavius.

I beg leave to offer to your consideration an emendation on the old Song called *Chevy Chace.*—When the widows are described bewailing their deceased husbands, 'tis said

> they kiss'd them *dead* a thousand times,
> when they were *clad in clay.*

If we interpret *clad in clay,* literally and truly, it must signifie *buried;* which would be nonsense. Some perhaps will say, it only signifies *dead;* that will make it tautology: *They kiss'd them* dead, *when they were* dead. Besides, a man may be more properly said to be *clad in clay,* when he is alive, than when he is *dead;* for when he is *dead,* he is *altogether clay,* and not properly *clad in clay.*—I do not question but you will agree with me, that the author wrote

> When they were cold as clay.

The northern way of pronouncing, *cold,* is, *cald,* which is nearer the Saxon *ceald;* and, perhaps, the Ms. might be so written, and then a mistake might be easily made by a southern printer. This reading is very agreeable to the whole passage.

> Next day did many widows come,
> Their husbands to bewail;
> They wash'd their wounds in brinish tears,
> But all would not prevail.
> Their bodies bath'd in purple blood
> They bore with them away;
> They kiss'd them dead a thousand times,
> When they were *cold as* clay.

In the last place, I observe this reading conveys a fine idea of the warm affections of the wives, who so lovingly embraced and *kissed* their husbands,

> When they *cold as* clay.

I am Sir, your most humble servant,

Zoilus.

---

[1] *Memoirs of the Society of Grub-Street,* II, 180-181.

Possibly with this emendation in mind, and certainly inspired by Bentley's edition of *Paradise Lost,* which had just appeared, another commentator wrote to the editor, in no. 137, for 17 August, 1732 (*Memoirs,* II, 323),

> Give me leave to propose an emendation in the Bentleian manner to the famous song called *Chevy Chace.* In the common Editions we read,
>
> A bow he had bent in his hand,
> Made of a trusty tree;
> An arrow of a cloth-yard long
> Full to the head drew he.[2]
>
> This corrupt reading leaves us to seek of what wood the *bow* was made, only informing us it was of a *tree;* and it makes the rime not *bold* enough. Read therefore on my authority,
>
> Made of a trusty *yew;*
> An arrow of a cloth-yard long
> Full to the head he drew.
>
> What an easy alteration is this? None but a dull wooden-headed blunderbuss of an Editor could suppose the Poet wrote otherwise. The *bows* were generally, if not always, made of *yew;* for which see Robin Hood's *Songs,* and *The life of Johnny Armstrong.*
>
> I am your humble servant,
> Philo-Bent.

Roger P. McCutcheon.

Denison University.

A Song and a Pun in Shakspere

Though word quibbling in serious writing is more or less out of favor now, the Elizabethans idolized a pun. In the dramas of that day plays on words spring up in most unexpected places, which not infrequently are offensive to the modern ear. Shakspere himself, as is well known, is no exception to that rule: his magic too was by no means pun-proof. An untiring search for these quibbles in him (as well as in his contemporaries) has revealed the most of them, and Dr. Wurth's collection [1] bears eloquent testimony to the relish which writers of that day found in word-catching.

The Shrew seemingly contains a pun which, I believe, has not been noted. In the scene at the hero's country-house Grumio, it will be remembered, has come in advance of the bridal couple to see that the house is in readiness when the master with his bride arrives. In the course of some foolery between Grumio and Curtis (another servant residing at the country-house) the former inquires

[2] This reading varies slightly from all of the versions given in Child.

[1] Wurth, "Das Wortspiel bei Shakspere," *Wiener Beiträge zur Engl. Phil.,* I (1895), pp. 1 ff.

if there is a fire for his master. Curtis assures him, adding: "and therefore, good Grumio, the news" (IV, i, 41 f.). To this Grumio replies: "Why, 'Jack, boy! ho! boy!' and as much news as thou wilt" (*ibid.*, 42 f.). A casual glance fails to see any connection between this snatch of song[2] and the situation; but since Shakspere ordinarily did not introduce bits of song gratuitously,[3] there must be some reason. The explanation, apparently, is to be found in the next line (omitted by the dramatist) of the stanza,—

The cat is in the well.[4]

The connection now seems clear, for there is a pun on Kate's name.[5] The audience was on the alert for quibbles in that corner, for hers was a pun-provoking name. Already there had been "wild-cat" (I, ii, 197); "Petruchio is Kated" (III, ii, 247); "Kate of Kate Hall" (II, i, 189); "super-dainty Kate" (*ibid.*); "dainties are all cates" (*ibid.*, 190); "the wild Kate" (*ibid.*, 279); "household Kates" (*ibid.*, 280).[6] In view of these repeated attacks on her name as well as the significant fact that Grumio had just remarked that she was tamed, it seems probable that Shakspere expected his hearers to get the pun in Grumio's song. If this suggestion be correct, light is also thrown on the extent to which an Elizabethan dramatist could assume a ready knowledge of popular songs; evidently it was not inconsiderable.[7]

ERNEST P. KUHL.

Goucher College.

OLD FRENCH *aigre*, "vinegar"

Old French dictionaries do not mention the use of the word *aigre* in the sense of *vinegar*. It is found in the glosses of Raschi[1] and also in other texts of Jewish origin. In the Oxford Glossary[2]

[2] The first line of the song is "Jack, boy, ho, boy, Newes!"

[3] Cf. Dr. John R. Moore's article in *Shakespeare Studies*. Madison, Wis., 1916. pp. 78 ff. Moore (pp. 93 f.) states that songs were "frequently used to incite characters to or against action," and notes among others this particular song.

[4] The words of the song are to be found in the *Henry Irving Shakespeare* and in Anders, *Shakespeare's Books*, Berlin, 1904, p. 182. Cf. Bond's note in his excellent (Arden) edition of the play (p. 95).

[5] Curtis was ignorant of the heroine's name.

[6] Shakspere in other plays puns on cat (cf. chap. IV of my forthcoming study on *The Authorship of The Shrew*).

[7] Cf. Moore, *op. cit.*; also Anders, *op. cit.*, pp. 168 ff. Hamlet (II, ii; III, ii) also assumes a knowledge of them. The dramatist elsewhere (Anders, 176, 182) makes a song an occasion for a pun.

[1] Ketoubot 75 *b*, A. Z. 12 *b*.

[2] L. 372, *aigre, acetum, homeç*.

which dates from the thirteenth century,[3] and in MS. 1243, fonds hébreu, of the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, *aigre* is used for *homeç* (vinegar). In the index of the Hebrew-French glossary published by Lambert and Brandin[4] *aygre,* in Numbers VI, 3, is explained as meaning "aigre"; the true meaning is "vinegar" (homeç).[5]

The word persists in various Norman dialects,[6] in Bas-Maine, in the form *ègr,* "cidre aigre, vinaigre"[7] and in Brittany, as *ęg,*[8] though the *Atlas linguistique de la France* of Gilliéron and Edmont[9] does not list such a form for the word *vinaigre.*[10]

An interesting variation from the modern word is found in the form *aigrevin,* which is cited by Godefroy from the fourteenth century in the poems of Eutache Deschamps,—"et prie Tout d'aigrevin et verjus destremper,"[11] and also from a document of the year 1391, from the abbey of Corbie. Cf. also Roquefort[12] and Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye.[13] *Aigrevin* is cited as used in Champagne by Tarbé[14] and it existed in Old Provençal in the form *agrevin.*[15]

A similar use of *aigre* is seen in an ordinance of Abbeville of 1494, which forbids merchants to sell "Aucuns aigres de bieres,

[3] Neubauer, in *Romanische Studien,* I, 1875, p. 164. Cf. von Wartburg, *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bonn and Leipzig, 1922), s. v. ACER, (accessible only after the completion of this article). Wartburg dates this text erroneously "a. 1100."

[4] *Glossaire hébreu-français du XIII siècle* (Paris, 1905).

[5] The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Mr. R. Levy and Professor D. S. Blondheim, of Johns Hopkins University, in connection with these Hebrew texts.

[6] Cf. Le Héricher, *Glossaire étymologique anglo-normand* (Avranches, 1884); Moisy, *Dictionnaire du patois normand* (Caen, 1887); Dubois, *Glossaire du patois normand* (Caen, 1856); Joret, *Le patois normand du Bessin* (Paris, 1881).

[7] Dottin, *Glossaire des parlers du Bas Maine* (Paris, 1899).

[8] Dagnet, *Vocabulaire coglais-français, Annales de Bretagne,* XVIII, 556 (Rennes, 1902). I owe the references to Joret, Dothin, and Dagnet to von Wartburg.

[9] Chart 1397.

[10] Such deficiencies of the *Atlas* have already been remarked by several scholars. Cf. M. Antoine Thomas, *Nouveaux essais de philologie française* (Paris, 1905) pp. 354-355; and Gottschalk, *Lat. "audire" im Französischen, Giessener Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie,* No. III, 1921, p. 5, in which he states that he checked the statements of the *Atlas* by those of a number of dictionaries and found that out of sixty-three instances, the Atlas was right in forty, incomplete in twelve, and apparently incorrect in eleven.

[11] VI, 101, ed. le Queux de Saint-Hilaire.

[12] *Glossaire de la langue romane* (Paris, 1808).

[13] *Dictionnaire historique de l'ancien français* (Paris, 1875).

[14] *Recherches sur l'histoire du langage et des patois de Champagne,* II, (Reims, 1851), p. 190.

[15] Levy, *Provençalisches Supplementwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1894), s. v.

rongys et coulouriez de moeures, ciesches et aultres fruits tirans de legier a corruption, pour et au lieu de aigres de vin." [16] *Aigre* in this passage is incorrectly defined as "ferment" by Godefroy,[17] though Thierry, p. 274, correctly renders it "vinaigre de bière." Compare the English use of *alegar* and *beeregar*, cited in the *New English Dictionary*, s. v., which dates *alegar* from 1542, and *beeregar* from 1500. *Alegar* is defined as "sour ale, or vinegar made from the acetous fermentation of ale." *Beeregar* is a similar liquor formed from beer.

MARY B. ROWE.

Johns Hopkins University.

VERSES ATTRIBUTED TO VOLTAIRE

I.—In 1869, Paul Lacroix published in the *Intermédiaire des Chercheurs et des Curieux* (Col. 135) a picturesque epigram, which Voltaire is said to have dictated the day before his death:

Vers dictés le 29 mai 1778.

Tandis que j'ai vécu l'on m'a vu hautement
Aux badauds effarés dire mon sentiment;
Je veux le dire encor dans les royaumes sombres,
S'ils ont des préjugés j'en guérirai les ombres.

Moland (XXXIII, p. 438) states that he does not believe that this epigram is by Voltaire. Yet, it is authentic, but it is not Voltaire's *last* verse. It has not been noticed that these four lines occur at the end of the well-known *Epître à Boileau ou mon Testament*,[1] which dates from March 1769, nine years before Voltaire's death.

II.—The *Voltairiana inedita aus den königlichen Archiven zu Berlin*, published by Wilhelm Mangold (Berlin, 1901) gives, on p. 38, a poem entitled *Le procès du Fard*, dedicated to the Duchesse de Gontaut and ascribed to Voltaire. The editor notes in his Preface that it is not Voltairian in tone. "Der Umstand dass das Gedicht nicht gerade hervorragend geistreich ist, darf nicht abhalten es Voltaire zuzuschreiben; denn nicht alles was er geschrieben hat, steht auf gleicher Höhe." This poem, however, has long been known as the work of Gentil Bernard. It occurs in

[16] A. Thierry, *Recueil de monuments inédits de l'histoire du tiers état* (1870), IV, p. 276.

[17] Complément, s. v. *aigre*.

[1] *Moland*, X, p. 402. The version of this *Epître* in the *Almanach des Muses* of 1770 (p. 5) contains a few uncollected minor variants.

his *Œuvres* (1823, p. 260.—1884, p. 310) and, moreover, he dedicated other poetry to the Duchesse de Gontaut, whereas her name does not appear in Voltaire's correspondence or in his other works.

III.—In the same *Voltairiana inedita* is found (p. 47) a small poem entitled: *Vers de Mr de V. à Mr le Comte D. sur le refus qui lui a été fait de revenir en France.*

Par votre humeur le monde est gouverné,
Vos volontés font le calme et l'orage;
Vous vous riez de me voir confiné
Loin de la cour, au fond de mon village.
N'est ce donc rien que d'être à soi,
D'être sans soins, de veiller sans emploi,[2]
D'avoir dompté la crainte et l'espérance?
Ah! Si le ciel, qui me traite si bien,
Avait pitié de vous et de la France,
Votre bonheur serait égal au mien!

These verses had already been printed in de Luchet's *Histoire littéraire de M. de Voltaire* (1781, V, p. 311). They were addressed to the Count d'Argenson, familiarly called *"la Chèvre":* In an eighteenth-century manuscript, in my possession, *Receuil de Pièces fugitives tant en prose qu' en vers,* they are said to have been composed by Voltaire but sent to M. d'Argenson by M. de Maurepas, when he was banished from the Court through Mme de Pompadour's influence.

Voltaire's editors have rejected it from his collected works, notwithstanding repeated contemporary attributions, because Voltaire denied having written it in his letter of September 13, 1756 to the Countess de Lutzelbourg.[3] "Je suis bien étonné qu'on m'attribue le compliment à la *Chèvre;* c'est une pièce faite du temps du Cardinal de Richelieu. Je ne suis point au fond de mon *village,* comme le dit le compliment; et il s'en faut beaucoup que j'aie à me plaindre de cette *Chèvre.*" In fact, except for the omission of four lines and two or three minor changes, this *compliment* is entirely copied from a sonnet of Maynard: (*Œuvres,* 1646, p. 31.—*Œuvres,* 1888, III, p. 31):

Par vos humeurs le monde est gouverné,
Vos volontés font le calme et l'orage., etc.

IV.—*An Epître attributed to Voltaire.*—In vol. X (p. 230) of

[2] M. Mangold's text is here manifestly incorrect. These two verses read in other MSS:

Mais n'est ce rien de se voir *tout* à soi,
D'être sans soins, de *vieillir* sans emploi, . . .

[3] See *Bengesco,* IV, p. 309.

the Moland edition of Voltaire's works is found an *Epître: A Samuel Bernard, au nom de Madame de Fontaine-Martel.*

> C'est Mercredi que je soupai chez vous,
> Et que, sortant des plaisirs de la table,
> Bientôt couchée, un sommeil prompt et doux
> Me fit présent d'un songe délectable, etc.

For the first time this poem was inserted in Voltaire's works in the Kehl edition (1784, vol. XIII, p. 19) and classified under the year 1716.[4] However, in their *Eclaircissements, Additions et Corrections* (vol. LXX, p. 516) the editors state that they had "de fortes raisons de croire que l'*Epître à Samuel Bernard* n'est pas de Voltaire. On ne l'avait laissé passer d'abord que dans la supposition que l'auteur avoit voulu se déguiser tout à fait, sous un nom emprunté, et il faut convenir qu'il n'aurait pu mieux donner le change qu'en faisant des vers communs et insignifiants."

It is to be regretted that the Kehl edition does not mention more explicitly what "serious reasons" were discovered for doubting Voltaire's authorship, for this would have prevented later editors from including it in his works. The suggestion that Voltaire would have written intentionally a weakly versified and common-place poem to hide his authorship, can, in the absence of all evidence, only be a gratuitous affirmation. A more weighty reason than its poetical weakness for not attributing this *Epître* to Voltaire is the fact that it occurs in the *Œuvres de Grécourt* (1802.—vol. I, p. 148) with another title, *Epître à Monsieur Croizat, après sa maladie.* The text of the poem makes it clear that the words "après sa maladie"—lacking in the version printed in Voltaire's works—refer to the circumstances in which it was written. Pluto depicts his kingdom as an abode of happiness, but adds:

> Mais un mortel m'embarasse beaucoup,
> Aussi je veux redoubler ses années:
> Chaque escadron le revendiquerait;
> La jalousie est au repos funeste.
> Venant ici, quel trouble il causerait!
> Il est là-haut très-heureux, qu'il y reste.

In the *Œuvres de Grécourt* the following lines — which are lacking in the works of Voltaire also—end the poem:

> Je sais qui c'est, et je vais lui mander.
> Je vous l'écris: Je serai fort contente
> Si son dessein peut ainsi s'accorder
> Avec les voeux de votre humble servante.

From all this it results that the *Epître à Samuel Bernard,* ascribed to Voltaire, is only a truncated version of de Grécourt's *Epître à Monsieur Croizat.*

G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

University of Minnesota.

[4] Cf. Bengesco.—*Bibliographie de Voltaire,* I, p. 210.

Thomas Jefferson and Molière

My colleague, Professor R. L. Rusk, has called my attention to a letter written by Thomas Jefferson to Dr. James Currie, and dated January the 18th, 1786, at Paris. After referring to the Encyclopédie, he adds:

"The medical part has not yet begun to appear, that author having chosen to publish the whole at once. I do not expect it will be the most valuable part of the work, for that science was demolished here by the blows of Molière, and in a nation so addicted to ridicule, I question if ever it rises under the weight while his comedies continue to be acted. It furnished the most striking proof I have ever seen in my life of the injury which ridicule is capable of doing."[1]

It is interesting to note that 113 years after Molière's death Jefferson should be of the opinion that in France the practice of medicine had not recovered from the effects of the good-natured satire of the great comic writer.

E. C. Hills.

Indiana University.

"Sweet, Reluctant, Amorous Delay" among Some Eighteenth Century English Poets

To every generation certain lines from great or near-great poets become by-words. But the by-words of one generation are apt to differ from those of another. One line from Milton seems to have become a by-word to English poets in the latter eighteenth century, and since then has returned to the class of lines which are admired but not continually quoted. In *Paradise Lost* (Book IV, lines 310-311), Eve yields to Adam's domination with "coy submission, modest pride,"

And sweet, reluctant, amorous delay.

Erasmus Darwin (*Temple of Nature,* Canto II, line 158) appropriates the entire line as it stands. Richard Payne Knight, in his didactic poem, *The Progress of Civil Society* (Book III, line 227), also appropriates it bodily, except for changing the "and" to "with." Neither writer acknowledges his source. Anna Seward, the Swan of Lichfield, imitates the line, in a letter to Miss Weston, 1787 (Miss Seward's *Correspondence,* Vol. I, page 264), as "sweet, reluctant, indolent delay," mentioning Milton in connection with it. William Collins echoes the line, though he does not appropriate it bodily, in his *Verses on a Paper which Contained a Piece of Bride-Cake given to the Author by a Lady* (line 19):

Reluctant pride, and amorous faint consent.

---

[1] *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson,* collected and edited by Paul Leicester Ford, Putnam's, New York, 1894, Vol. IV, pp. 132-133.

William Blake, too, echoes it (Rossetti MSS. xxiii. Sampson edition of Blake's lyrical poems, page 172):

> If an amorous delay
> Clouds a sunshiny day—

Evidently, then, the line was common property to the poets of the time. Why the late eighteenth century used it more often than our present post-Victorian age does, is an interesting but perhaps somewhat nebulous subject for speculation.

G. R. Potter.

Dartmouth College.

The Evening Star in Milton

Regarding the difficulties in Milton's references to the evening star (*Comus,* 93-4 and *Lycidas* 30-31) I have the following suggestions to offer by way of supplement to Professor Emerson's authoritative discussions in *MLN.* XXXVII, 118 and *Anglia,* XXXIX, 495.

In the Comus passage may not the phrase "top of Heaven" mean "the upper half of the celestial sphere" rather than "the zenith" or, as Professor Emerson understands it, simply "a high point in the sky"? Such an interpretation, besides making the passage astronomically accurate and being in accord with Milton's general habits of expression, gives a better poetic sense as well. Hesperus "holds" the entire visible Heavens as their sole lord.[1]

In the expression "rose at evening" in *Lycidas* the verb is to be taken loosely in the sense of appear. Professor Emerson suggests the possibility of this interpretation but gives no supporting instances before Milton. Such instances are to be found in the classics, notably in Horace, *Odes,* II, ix:

> Tu semper urges flebilibus modis
> Mysten ademptum, nec tibi Vespero
> Surgente decedunt amores
> Nec rapidum fugiente solem.

The Latin usage was perhaps determined by the ambiguous sense of the Greek ἀνέρχομαι ('rise,' 'return').[2] With the Lycidas pas-

[1] Spenser in a passage cited by Emerson as containing the probable original of Milton's phrase presumably thought of the star as rising in the east and ascending towards the zenith (*F. Q.,* III, IV, 51; cf. *Epithalamion,* 285). Milton, who is on the whole conscientiously scientific even in poetry and whom another of Emerson's quotations shows to have been correctly informed regarding the phenomena (*P. L.* IX, 48-50), must consciously or unconsciously have corrected the image when he adopted the expression.

[2] In such a passage as Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica,* IV, 1629, ἀνὰ δ' ἤλυθεν ἀστὴρ αὔλιος, cited by Emerson to illustrate the expression "folding star." This line is translated by Seaton (Loeb Classics) "and when the star *returned* that bids the shepherd fold."

sage we may compare also *P. L.* IV, 355, "The stars that usher evening rose," which has a close parallel in *Aeneid* IV, 352, "quotiens astra ignea surgunt." Here, of course, the literal meaning might be defended, but the sense "came out" is at least truer to the phenomenon than the sense "emerged from below the horizon," and the point is likely not to have escaped observation by so close a scholar as Milton.

JAMES H. HANFORD.

The University of Michigan.

BRIEF MENTION

English for the English: a Chapter on National Education, by George Sampson (Cambridge, University Press, 1922). This is the third impression of a little book (vii, 112 pp.), first issued a year ago. The approval of the booklet is justified by the author's mature judgment and by his mode of expression, which is direct and effective and enlivened by the graces of an entertaining but deeply serious mind. Something of the style of his convictions and of his manner of expression may be at once indicated by the following citations: "How can it be pretended that education has any specific application to tasks in which there is no need for intelligence? The lift-man would work his switch no worse if he were quite illiterate and no better if he were a doctor of science. It is not as a lift-man that he is worth educating, but as a man. . . . . You cannot educate children above their station, for you are educating men and women; and in this world there is no higher station" (pp. 6-7). And more specifically: "I think it is fairly safe to say that the worst science teaching, or French teaching, or geography teaching, or indeed any other kind of teaching, is never quite so bad as the worst English teaching and never quite so common" (p. 73). "The only compositions that can be corrected are those that least need correction" (p. 56). And let this be considered: "If there is one thing more pleasing and wholesome than anything else in the boy, it is his entire disregard of first principles and his refusal to behave (in bulk) like the hypothetical Child of the educational treatises. That is what troubles young teachers: they have been led to expect The Child, and they encounter children" (p. 57). We are reminded (p. vi) that the author writes with "the convictions of a teacher who has been engaged in elementary work for twenty-five years, and who feels more certain with every added year that the present elementary system is a failure and needs re-orientation." To this is added the philosophic conviction: "I believe that the great purpose of education is not to make people *know* something but to make

people *be* something,"—a purpose that is not, in his judgment "at present fulfilled by our schools." Mr. Sampson is writing exclusively concerning the schools of England. That is an advantage to the American educator. It must help him to gain a surer hold on the universal validity of educational principles. In this connection one is impelled to record the report that Lord Haldane, speaking several months ago at the University of Manchester, defined education as "the progressive liberation of the inmost potentialities of man." The underlying thought, in agreement with Mr. Sampson's teaching, is that the true purpose of education holds its processes together in organic unity from the lowest forms up into the University. Now, Mr. Sampson finds the elementary teachers officially hindered in their true function: "I believe that the recommended interest of teachers in the 'science' of education—in "psycho-analysis' (imported from Germany), in 'tests of intelligence' (imported from France), and in 'experimental psychology' (imported from America)—means excessive concern with the heads of children and no concern for their souls."

Mr. Sampson's preliminary chapters deserve thoughtful attention. The true function of the elementary school is earnestly discussed, and a fearless attitude is taken toward the new psychology, so far as it tends to divert the teacher's mind from the business of teaching to that of collecting data for the science of education. Psychology "can and should assist the teacher, but it must not obsess the teacher." And in a fresh and enthusiastic manner the fundamental importance of early and persistent training in the effective use of the vernacular language is affirmed. The expression is at times notably effective: "The tragic position in the elementary school is that *English cannot wait.* Other subjects can, and yet it is to them that our chief efforts are directed" (p. 23).

English as a school-subject (but with special reference to the elementary schools) is methodically treated in "A Programme," the principal division of the book (pp. 40-95). Six aspects of the subject are taken up in order. (1) Standard Speech, which must be the language of the schools. This "need not be fatal to local idiom," but "the English boy has an indefeasible right to the King's English." There must in due time be instruction in the use of the speech-organs: "a teacher of speech untrained in phonetics is as useless as a doctor untrained in anatomy." (2) The second topic is "talk-training," which is to mean that whatever subject be taught, it should be a subject "embodied in decent speech." To put the matter vividly: "the boy who slobbers out history in smears and messes of words, simply does not know his history, even if the facts he has emitted are correct." A general charge is preferred: "Less time is spent in school on the spoken language than on any other activity, and yet none needs more"

(p. 48). The close of this section, tho so obviously true, is too profoundly significant not to be quoted: "What can literature possibly mean to children whose habitual misshapen and untaught speech bears no resemblance to what they see in print? For them, in a sense, English literature is in a foreign language. To speech the rest can be added. Correct and lucid speech is not only an ornament and grace of life: it is one of the first and last necessities of corporate existence." The schools do not demonstrate in theory and in practice the philosophic conception of what is at once the most practical and the most fundamentally cultural subject.

The remaining aspects of English as a subject in the elementary school here considered are: (3) "Regular practice in the art of listening"; (4) "Systematic training in the art of writing" (pp. 51-75,—one of the longer chapters); (5) "Systematic training in the use of books"; (6) "The induction to literature (pp. 77-95,—also a long chapter). A "Conclusion" (pp. 96-109) and an "Epilogue" (pp. 110-112) follow and serve to drive home the arguments of the treatise by additional evidence, and to heighten, if possible, the pitch of the author's earnestness of purpose.

The American teacher will find Mr. Sampson's chapters profitable,—in many instances embarrassingly profitable, for they abound in frank but constructive reproof,—and will be especially grateful to the publishers for keeping the booklet in print. J. W. B.

Tassoni in Frankreich, by Erhard Schiffer. Berlin, 1915. 126 pp. Although published a few years ago, the thesis of Herr Schiffer is among those which, owing to the war, have only recently been received in this country. Though purporting to be an investigation of the influence of Tassoni in France, it is in reality a very one-sided and unconvincing piece of work. He has dismissed the discussion of the *Secchia rapita,* Tassoni's chief claim to fame, with a few pages in an appendix. He has put all the stress on the *Pensieri diversi,* a work manifestly not having much importance, for it was probably not translated into French and had no appreciable influence even in Italy. He has endeavored to show that the quarrel of the ancients and the moderns had its instigation in Italy, when everyone knows that the *querelle* was localized in France and was brought about by conditions entirely indigenous. Led astray by his conviction that Tassoni ought to have had some relationship in this controversy, he sets out to analyze the *Pensieri* and check up Tassoni's statements with those of the French theorists. Schiffer should have known that he would seek in vain for influence in those authors whom he discusses. It is not in the writings of Chapelain or Desmarets that one would expect to find any *rapprochement* with this mock-heroic epic writer of Italy. Where influence would probably be found is in writers such as

Scarron, d'Assoucy, Colletet, Cyrano de Bergerac, who created a rather formidable list of burlesque works in France. One seeks in vain in the thesis of Herr Schiffer for any new light on this subject.

In his introductory chapter Schiffer endeavors to show that Italian influence on the quarrel is deeply rooted. His quotations, however, are unconvincing and ill-chosen, for they deal with general critical theories and have nothing to do with the *querelle*. One finds cited only six investigators to support his claim of having found "numerous" assertions of the influence of Tassoni on the quarrel, and their statements are largely conjectural and therefore valueless. The conclusion is a splendid example of what a conclusion should not be. In his last paragraph he asserts that the *Pensieri* appeared at least fifty years too late to have had any new influence on French critics. One wonders why Herr Schiffer did not ascertain this before writing his thesis. R. C. W.

England and the Englishman in German Literature of the Eighteenth Century. By John Alexander Kelly, Ph. D. New York, Columbia University Press, 1921. 156 pp. Der Verfasser schildert in sieben Kapiteln: Physical Characteristics of England. Politics and Religion. Economic Conditions. English Culture. Customs and Manners. The British Character. Individual British Types. Er hat einen reichen Stoff fleissig und gewissenhaft zusammengetragen und damit ein brauchbares Nachschlagebuch geschaffen, das vielen Nutzen stiften kann. Leider sind neben der blossen Beschreibung die geschichtliche Einschätzung und die Kritik zu kurz gekommen. So hätte für die rechte Betrachtung sowohl der Anschluss mit dem 17. als auch mit dem 19. Jahrhundert gesucht werden müssen, damit das Besondere der betrachteten Zeit klar wurde. Auch wäre die eine oder andere geschichtliche Entwicklung, z. B. der Siebenjährige Krieg, zu erwähnen. Es ist sicher auch nicht zufällig, dass Archenholz zugleich der Geschichtsschreiber jenes Krieges und ein eifriger Student Englands war. Der Verfasser zitiert gelegentlich Raumer und noch lieber Theodor Fontane, aber der Zusammenhang mit seiner eigenen Darstellung ist gar zu lose. Bei der Erwähnung der englischen Gartenkunst (S. 37 f.) lag der Name von Fürst Pückler-Muskau ganz nahe. Die Bemerkungen über die Aufnahme der englischen Literatur durch die Deutschen des 18. Jahrhunderts (S. 39 ff.) gehen nicht sehr tief, nur manche Kleinigkeit besonders aus der *Allgemeinen deutschen Bibliothek* ist neu. Eine gewisse Vorliebe für den britischen Charakter verführt den Verfasser zu gelegentlicher Kritiklosigkeit (S. 29 u. 81). Im ganzen ist Kellys löbliche Zusammenstellung eine neue Anregung zu einer gründlicheren Erforschung des deutsch-britischen Verhältnisses im 18. Jahrhundert. F. S.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVII DECEMBER, 1922 NUMBER 8

THE STRUCTURE OF SHAKESPEARE'S TRAGEDIES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO *CORIOLANUS*

The late Henry N. Hudson was a great admirer of Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*. He said:

> I hold it to be among his greatest triumphs in organization: I cannot point out, I believe no one has pointed out, a single instance where the parts might have been better ordered for the proper effect of the whole; . . . the unity of impression is literally perfect. In this great point of dramatic architecture, I think it bears the palm clean away from both the other Roman tragedies; and indeed I am not sure but it should be set down as the peer of *Othello*.[1]

A German scholar, Heinrich Viehoff, is also positive that no drama of the master is superior to this in artistic completeness and effectiveness.[2]

Professor MacCallum thinks *Coriolanus* to be "technically and artistically a more perfect achievement" than either of Shakespeare's previous Roman plays.[3]

The question naturally arises: how far is the drama indebted to Plutarch for its unity and power? But one has only to read the two accounts side by side to see in what an endless variety of ways Shakespeare has condensed, hastened, unified, intensified, and supplemented the somewhat wandering story of Plutarch. Shakespeare himself is the real source of the intimate, vigorous dramatic life that permeates the play. He recasts his material more freely here than in *Julius Caesar* or *Antony and Cleopatra*. He improves

[1] *Harvard Shakespeare*, Ginn, 1881, Vol. XVIII, p. 180.
[2] *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, IV (1869), pp. 41 f.
[3] *Shakespeare's Roman Plays*, 1910, p. 479.

upon his original in the greater vividness of the characters and in the closeness and skill of the interweaving.

Excepting Coriolanus himself all of the characters in Plutarch's sketch are faint and vague.[4] In Plutarch Menenius does not appear again after telling the fable of the belly and the members. The tribunes disappear after Marcius is banished. Aufidius is not mentioned until Marcius goes to his house, and is not present at the great scene between Coriolanus and his mother. Volumnia has nothing to do with the suit of Marcius for the consulship; and his solicitation for that office is not brought into any connection either with the war against the Volscians or with the banishment of the hero.[5]

That the speech in which Coriolanus announces himself to Aufidius follows Plutarch closely, and that "nowhere has Shakespeare borrowed so much through so great a number of lines as in Volumnia's appeal to the piety of her son"[6] are facts which easily mislead one as to the extent of the poet's indebtedness to his source. And the telling close of Volumnia's plea, which finally overpowers the hero, is new to Shakespeare:

> Come, let us go.
> This fellow had a Volscian to his mother;
> His wife is in Corioli, and his child
> Like him by chance.—Yet give us our dispatch.
> I am hush'd until our city be a-fire,
> And then I'll speak a little.
>
> (V, iii, 177-182.)

I must admit that the play seems to me defective at one point. In Plutarch the opportune and skillful recounting of the fable of the belly and the members by Menenius causes the plebeians to become reconciled to the patricians on condition that the people be granted tribunes with ample power. In the play, while Menenius is talking to one body of plebeians, another company obtains from the hostile patricians the concession that they may have tribunes to protect them. This granting of tribunes has no natural

[4] MacCallum, p. 494.

[5] Delius has presented in some detail the relation of the play to the source in *Abhandlungen zu Shakspere*, 1889, I, 388-416. Reprinted from the *Jahrbuch* for 1876. See also the work of MacCallum.

[6] MacCallum, p. 484.

relation to the bread-riot which Shakespeare has depicted. The populace "ask for bread and get a magistrate."[7] Shakespeare makes the colloquy between Menenius and his audience supremely vivid and interesting. Hardly any serio-comic passage in the plays reads better. But because it is not made causative in any way, super-excellent as it is in itself, it is good *for* nothing. Surely this is an artistic mistake, an unfortunate alteration of the story of Plutarch.

The play has been criticized at another point. Coleridge felt that the treacherous Aufidius of I, X, who longs to wash his fierce hand in the heart of Caius Marcius, and the hospitable Aufidius, who welcomes to Antium his former enemy (IV, V), cannot be the same person.[8] I do not recognize any inconsistency here. The impulsive warmth with which the Volscian leader receives Coriolanus is natural enough, but it represents an attitude that cannot endure, both men being what they are. However, a recent scholarly study of the play seeks to explain how Shakespeare came to portray "two Aufidiuses," and makes this comment:

> Aufidius is the weak point of the play. Dramatically, his function is to play in the second part of the play the rôle held by Sicinius and Brutus, the Tribunes, in the first, but to play it with more steadiness of hatred even than they, because Aufidius has to accomplish Coriolanus's death, while the Tribunes need only his exile. But whereas the Tribunes play the part to the life, . . . Aufidius is as impulsive as Coriolanus himself, and as evidently incapable of plotting as he. Instead of being plainer to us than Sicinius and Brutus, he becomes ten times as shadowy.[9]

I will call attention here to the whole-souled sympathy of approbation which the late Professor Barrett Wendell bestowed upon the character of Coriolanus. I quote a few expressions:

> The people, . . . that great underlying mass of humanity . . . is presented in *Coriolanus* with ultimate precision. . . . The fate of Coriolanus . . . comes from no decadence, no corruption, no vicious weakness, but rather from a passionate excess of inherently noble traits, whose very nobility unfits them for survival in the ignoble world about them. . . . In *Coriolanus* we find Shakspere, with almost cynical coldness, artistically

---

[7] MacCallum, p. 525.

[8] *Lectures on Shakspere*, Bell, p. 310.

[9] "Coriolanus," *The London Times Literary Supplement*, July 27, 1922, 481 f.

expounding the inherent weakness of moral nobility, the inherent strength and power of all that is intellectually and morally vile.[10]

It makes one rub one's eyes to read such an estimate of the proud, intractable, passionate, self-destroyed Coriolanus.

Gustav Freytag pointed out that tragedies naturally fall into two classes. In one class, the action is initiated by the central figure, the hero; in the other type, some great opponent of the hero is the initiating agent, or some group of opponents.[11] Let us call these two contrasted kinds of tragedy the Macbeth type and the Othello type.

Each of these kinds has a characteristic danger. In a tragedy of the Macbeth type, the usual kind, the resolution or fall of the action, previous to the actual catastrophe, is apt to be somewhat distracting and lacking in interest. In general, we may say that the fourth act is likely to prove comparatively weak. Let us look into the reasons for this.

During the first part of *Macbeth,* or any play of that class, the hero monopolizes our interest. We see him boldly assert himself and reach out after some coveted prize; and our sympathy goes out to this challenging, aggressive leader. But at last he takes some fatal step, and we feel that his ruin has begun. The opposition to the hero, the counterplay, must now take the lead, since it is destined to destroy him. This opposition may have several leaders, such as Malcolm, Macduff, and the other nobles in *Macbeth.* Some of these leaders are likely to be almost new; none of them interests us in comparison with the great hero; and their number cannot compensate for their relative insignificance. The slow defeat of the hero is an unpleasant spectacle, and we have not yet reached the compensating intensity of the tragic close. Because the opposition now claims our attention, the leading character is apt to be absent from the stage for a time. In *Macbeth* the play travels off to England for a disproportionately long scene, and the hero is neglected; Hamlet is sent away to England, while the foreground is filled with the plotting of the King and Laertes,

[10] *William Shakspere,* 1894, pp. 329, 330, 334. I have been much helped by this stimulating book, though here disagreeing with it.

[11] *Die Technik des Dramas,* 7te Aufl., Leipzig, 1894, pp. 93 ff. In the Eng. translation, Chicago, 2d ed. 1896, pp. 104 ff.

and with the pathetic ravings of Ophelia; in *Julius Caesar* Antony and Octavius are in power.

Indeed, the resolution of any play is apt to be somewhat lacking in interest, because of the fact that the outcome of the play has by this time been pretty clearly indicated and prepared for. All of us have something of the interest of a child or of an untrained spectator in the mere going on of the story, in the question how the affair will turn out; and, however well known the play is, we all take the point of view of one hearing it for the first time. The play loses something of its zest and charm when the progress of the action indicates plainly what the outcome will be. Especially in a great tragedy, the catastrophe has been clearly pointed out and arranged for by the time the fourth act is well under way. At this point, therefore, the audience is naturally disposed to dulness and lack of interest.

It is evident that tragedies of the type of *Othello* have an advantage at this stage of the action where tragedies of the Macbeth type are in danger. The action of *Othello* really begins with the plot of Iago against Othello and Desdemona, at the close of the first act; and from this point on that villain manages everything, while the Moor is the unsuspecting victim of his wiles. In the great third scene of Act III, Iago convinces the hero of the guilt of Desdemona. Othello, roused to fury, calls forth our most intense interest and compassion as he storms on toward the doom that awaits him. We are deeply stirred with sympathy during just that stage of the action which in *Macbeth* and similar tragedies tends to be distracting and weak.

Freytag says of tragedies of the Othello type:

> It might appear that this method of dramatic construction must be the more effective. Gradually, in a specially careful presentation, one sees the conflicts through which the life of the hero is disturbed give direction to the hidden forces of his nature. Just there, where the hearer demands a powerful intensifying of effects, the previously prepared leadership of the chief characters begins; suspense and sympathy, which are more difficult to sustain in the last half of the play, are firmly fixed upon the chief characters; the stormy and irresistible progress downward to destruction is particularly favorable to powerful and thrilling effects.[12]

There is one portion of tragedies of the Othello type, however, which it is hard to make successful, and that is the complication,

[12] P. 96; in the translation (not followed here), p. 108.

speaking roughly the second act of the play and the first part of the third. Here the hero is passive, inert; others are plotting against him; he is ignorant of the true state of the case; he is deceived and hoodwinked. How shall we be interested in such a hero and sympathize with him? It has been said that there are communities to-day that would be inclined, in witnessing the drama, to sympathize with Iago rather than with Othello.

Shakespeare overcomes this great difficulty in the action of *Othello* by means of the character of Iago. He makes that officer such a subtle schemer, such a smooth and attractive deceiver, that we do not consider Othello either weak or foolish because he is deceived and led on to his ruin by the machinations of his pretended friend.

It is generally recognized that Iago is Shakespeare's most consummate villain, but it is perhaps not clearly seen that he had to be this, or else the play would be a partial failure. It is only because Iago is such a subtle and masterly villain that we can see him dupe the unsuspecting Othello without impairing our respect for that noble, high-minded hero. But there can be no question about the reality of the danger to which the play is exposed at this point, the danger that Othello shall appear a weak and unworthy character rather than one really tragic.

We see clearly that the Macbeth and Othello types of tragedy are the exact counterparts of each other. It is comparatively easy in a play of the Macbeth type to make the complication successful, but a difficult matter to make the resolution strong and effective. In a play of the Othello type the case is just reversed; the complication is for the playwright the more dangerous and difficult stage of the action; but throughout the closing half of the play the hero fills the stage, and the interest of the audience is assured. It is safe to say that the intense tragic power manifest in the second half of *Othello* is surpassed by nothing in the dramatic literature of the world.

King Lear has not yet been mentioned here among the illustrations of dramatic structure. The late Professor Price of Columbia University pointed out that the story of King Lear by itself "is only a psychological study." The fatal step of Lear is the laying down of his royal power. After that, he "is incapable of any action at all. He is simply driven, by force of circumstances,

as the result of the action already done, into deeper and deeper depths of humiliation and misery."

> The pitiful story of the mad king, after the 1st scene of the 1st Act, was, as Shakspere rightly saw, devoid of the true dramatic quality, and incapable of shaping itself into a real drama. This was the reason that led him, as I think, to supplement the story of Lear and Cordelia by the story of Gloucester and Edmund. . . . For the story of Edmund had in itself just what the story of Lear lacked, the definite dramatic emotion and the definite dramatic action. It was capable, therefore, of absorbing into itself the story of Lear's calamities, and of carrying it along with itself to a dramatic conclusion. As the result of this fusion, it is the study of Lear's character and the picture of his mental decay that form the pathos and the vital charm of the poem; but it is the passion and the action of Edmund, the rise and downfall of his fortunes, that supply the form of the drama and its dramatic movement.[13]

The Edmund story, the only complete, structural action in this play, is plainly of the Macbeth type. Macbeth and Edmund are both villain-heroes, each reaching out to grasp a forbidden prize.

In the action of *Coriolanus* there is no dead point. Every scene is vital, every character is both helpful and consistent, every element of the play contributes to an interesting, constantly developing unity of effect.[14] Why is it that this drama is pre-eminent among the plays of Shakespeare in these respects?

Two closely related actions make up the drama. The main action, the strife between Brutus and Sicinus, the leaders of the plebeians, and Caius Marcius, is prepared for at once in the outspoken bitterness of the common people toward their especial enemy. The second action, the contest between Marcius and the Volscians under Aufidius, is so closely involved with the first that it does not impair the unity. The play is not divided because of this second line of interest, it is enriched and enlarged. The interweaving of the two strands is intimate, complete. The character, the deeds, and the fate of Caius Marcius constitute the absorbing interest in which both actions are united.

The first war against the Volscians, in which Corioli is captured and Marcius wins his title 'Coriolanus,' is felt to some degree as a separate portion of the play. The Volscians begin this conflict,

[13] *Publications of the Modern Language Assoc. of America*, IX (1894), pp. 174-75.

[14] See Viehoff's article in *Jahrbuch*, IV, already cited.

but Marcius at once takes the leadership against them. Shakespeare represents him as the only Roman who foresaw and foretold this struggle; this gives him distinct pre-eminence.

First Senator. Marcius, 'tis true that you have lately told us;
The Volsces are in arms. (I, i, 231-32.)

The energy with which Marcius throws himself into this war, his extravagant bravery and prowess in entering the gates of Corioli alone and fighting his way safely out, his winning of the city, his hurrying to the relief of the army of Cominius, his single-handed defeat of Aufidius and his companions, and the bestowal upon him of the proud title 'Coriolanus,'—all these things mark him as the active leader and hero of the war. We feel this portion of the story as a separate action of the Macbeth type.

This victory makes our hero the natural candidate for the consulship, in accordance with the heart's desire of his mother. He reluctantly asks the people to accept him as consul, to give their 'voices' in his behalf. In spite of his haughty manner they grant his request. The tribunes Sicinius and Brutus then induce the citizens to withdraw their assent. This will so enrage Coriolanus as to bring about his overthrow.

Brutus . . . If, as his nature is, he fall in rage
With their refusal, both observe and answer
The vantage of his anger. (II, iii, 266-68.)

The plot succeeds. Coriolanus is so angered by the fickleness of the populace that he demands that the grant to them of tribunes be revoked. For this proposal his death is demanded. Yielding to his mother's entreaty he tries to speak gently to the plebeians; but a new fit of anger overcomes him, he explodes in words that cannot be forgiven, and the doom of banishment is pronounced against him. As he departs into exile, he says ominously:

I go alone,
Like to a lonely dragon, that his fen
Makes fear'd and talk'd of more than seen. (IV, i, 29-31.)

Later he offers himself to Aufidius as an ally, and leads a Volscian army against Rome. The eloquent pleading of his mother saves the city from destruction, but leads directly to his own death at the hands of Aufidius and his friends.

This action of the tribunes against Coriolanus is distinctly of the Othello type, but it is strikingly free from the dangers to which that type is exposed. The plotting of Brutus and Sicinius is so skillful and so well covered up, it is so condensed, and directed so effectively to the weak points in the character of Coriolanus, that its plausibility is complete. Skillful as is the management of the plot in Othello, it is not so entirely plausible as the main action of this play.[15]

Thus the deft combination of what we feel to be an action of the Macbeth type with one distinctly of the Othello type gives to the whole play an intense and unremitting energy that it would be hard to parallel. The first portion of the play has the energy and success that mark an opening of the Macbeth type; the close of the play is of the Othello sort, and has the intense power which distinguishes an action of this kind. Our attention is fixed upon the hero at all times. He takes the lead both in his own exaltation and in his own destruction.

When Coriolanus gives up his revengeful purpose and yields to the entreaty of his mother, he wins our sympathy, and at the same time insures his own ruin. This moral victory gives pathos to the scene of his death, the close of the play. The heart of the spectator is uplifted and purified.

If *Coriolanus* is so admirable as a work of art, why has it never been popular? Professor A. C. Bradley points out that the drama has not the universality that marks the greatest tragedies, that it does not employ the supernatural, that nature is not treated imaginatively "as a vaster fellow-actor and fellow-sufferer," that there is no exhibition of inward conflict, and that there is "never such magical poetry as we hear in the four greatest tragedies."[16]

It is also true that the anti-democratic spirit of the play is displeasing to many.[17] The English-speaking nations, interested

[15] Professor E. E. Stoll, *Othello: An Historical and Comparative Study*, The University of Minnesota, 1915, holds that the plot of *Othello* is lacking in plausibility. He is partly answered by E. K. Chambers in *The Modern Language Review*, Oct. 1916, pp. 466-67.

[16] *Coriolanus* (Lecture before the British Academy), Oxford University Press, 1912, pp. 4-5.

[17] I have discussed this feature in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXIX (1914), pp. 285-86, 290.

in making the world safe for democracy, cannot sympathize fully with a play that flatly contradicts Plutarch's account in order to represent the Roman populace as completely fickle, incapable, cowardly, and subject to demagogues.

ALBERT H. TOLMAN.

The University of Chicago.

THE FORTUNES OF LAMARTINE IN SPAIN

Larra, in his review of Martínez de la Rosa's poems (*Revista Española,* No. 91, Sept. 3, 1833) remarks that the day of Gessner and Meléndez is passed in Spain, and that that of Lamartine and Byron has arrived. "Buscamos más bien," are his words, "*la importante y profunda inspiración de Lamartine,* y hasta la desconsoladora filosofía de Byron que la ligera y fugitiva impresión de Anacreonte."

The famous critic seems to have been somewhat impressed by the importance of the work of Lamartine to the then unformed Romanticism of Spain. When in 1835 he wishes to characterize the bucolic poems of J. B. Alonso, it is with Byron and Lamartine that he contrasts him (*Revista Española,* No. 484, Feb. 19, 1835),[1] and we meet so constantly collocations like "Chateaubriand y Lamartine," "Walter Scott, Casimir Delavigne y Lamartine," "Victor Hugo y Lamartine," that it is quite superfluous to cite references. To Larra Lamartine was certainly one of the foremost Romantic poets of the day.

But he had also been recognized in Spain as a leading Romantic

[1] "Examinemos el libro en venta, no ya comparando a nuestro autor con lord Byron o Lamartine, puesto que su género es tan distinto que difícilmente se le pudieran hallar puntos de contacto."

The collocation of Byron and Lamartine, which to modern ears sounds strange, may well be due to the latter's preoccupation with Byron. *Cf. Diario Mercantil de Cádiz,* May 6, 1827, where an anonymous writer even says of Byron: "El más sobresaliente de sus imitadores ha sido el francés La-Martine." An article in the *Revista Española* of May 23, 1834 (on the *Moro Expósito*), which some have thought to be by Larra, insists upon the essentially different character of the Romanticism of Byron and Lamartine.

more than ten years before. The importance of the cosmopolitan *Europeo*[2] in the evolution of Spanish Romanticism is generally recognized, although its influence may perhaps not always have been as great as its merits warranted. Among the literary notices and reviews written by Aribau as early as 1823 we find the following:

M. A. de Lamartine, ya conocido por sus *Meditaciones poéticas,* ha publicado una nueva producción de su raro ingenio que hace concebir a su patria las más bellas esperanzas. Su título es *La Muerte de Sócrates.* La única noticia circunstanciada que tenemos es el ventajoso anuncio que de ella hace el diario de debates del 14 de setiembre último, el cual cita fragmentos verdaderamente apreciables. Todos llevan el carácter de las ideas religiosas que descubre ya el autor en sus primeras composiciones: sus ideas son sencillas, su expresión enérgica y elegante.

Then follows a short extract from the review mentioned, translated into Spanish.[3]

Yet, when we turn to the part which Lamartine actually played in the formation of Spanish Romanticism, we are reminded that the *Europeo* was not an entirely representative Spanish journal. The influence of the poet, indeed, seems to have been very small: in the first half of the nineteenth century he is little but a name in Spain. The only translations of Lamartine in book form, for example, which I have found, prior to 1850, are the following:

Poesías entresacadas de las obras de A. de Lamartine, traducidas por el Marqués de Casa-Tara (D. T. M. de Berriozabal); Madrid, Aguado, 1839. (In Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid.)

Viaje a la Palestina; Valencia, Cervera, 1844. (In Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid.)

Viaje al Oriente, traducido por . . . ; Madrid, Madoz, 1846. (In Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid.)

Historia de los Girondinos; Madrid, 1847. (In Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid; as is also a translation published in Mexico, 1848.)

Rafael, páginas de los *veinte años,* traducidas por V. Balaguer. Barcelona, 1849. (In library of the University of Barcelona.)

Hidalgo adds (but I have not traced these):

Viaje a Oriente; Córdoba, 1840; Paris 1843.

[2] See, for a general account of this periodical, *Modern Language Review,* October, 1920, pp. 375-382.

[3] *Europeo,* 1823, p. 355.

Historia de los Girondinos; Madrid, 1847; Madrid, 1847-8; Sevilla, 1847-8.
Rafael, Madrid, 1849 (three translations).
Las Confidencias, 1849.

Compare with this the following chronological list, which represents translations published in book form subsequently to 1850:[4]

1850. Historia de la Revolución de 1848 (together with several undated translations of the same work).
1851. Historia de la Restauración (two separate translations, and there are two more bearing no date).
1852. El Civilizador. (Retratos históricos.)
1851-2. Historia de los Girondinos.
(1853. Historia de la Restauración, published in Mexico.)
1853. Genoveva; Toussaint l'Ouverture. (Translated as "Dos perlas literarias.") Graziella (Hid.).
1854. Historia de los Girondinos; Graziella (Hid.); Rafael (Hid.).
1856. Graziella (Hid.).
1857. Piconpedrero; Genoveva; Rafael (all Hid.).
1858. El Civilizador.
(1860. Las Nuevas Confidencias, traducidas por J. J. Borda; Bogotá, 1860. In British Museum.)
1860. Picapedrero de S. Point; Graziella.
1860. Genoveva (popular and recent translations of which are also listed in the *Biblioteca rosa* and the *Biblioteca selecta*).
1864-6. Las Confidencias, Nuevas Confidencias y Ultimas Confidencias.
1864. Biografía de Colón. (Also published in the *Biblioteca universal.*)
1875. Jocelyn.
1876. Cicerón.
1886. Regina.
1887. Regina.
1904. Historia de los Girondinos.
1913. Jocelyn.
1913. Jocelyn.
1919. Graziella.

The significance of these two chronological lists is clear. In spite of the recognition by Aribau, Larra, and others of the merit and importance of Lamartine's contributions to literature, his

[4] I have suppressed the full details in this list, as the individual translations are less important than the earlier ones. All these translations are to be found in the Biblioteca Nacional, except where the name of another library is added to the title.

poetry found but little acceptance in Spain. Neither the *Méditations poétiques,* which heralded French Romanticism in 1820, nor the *Nouvelles Méditations* (1823), nor the *Harmonies poétiques et religieuses* (1830) seem to have been translated in their entirety. A volume of selections, published in 1839, is all that takes their place before 1850. The fact that Chateaubriand's accounts of his journeys had already had some vogue in Spain may account for the two comparatively early translations of Lamartine's travels.[5] *Raphaël,* it will be noted, was translated in the very year of its appearance by the alert young *literato,* Victor Balaguer. But the earlier collections met with little or no welcome.

Lamartine's historico-political writings, on the other hand, met with a reception which contrasts strongly with that accorded to his verse. The "History of the Revolution of 1848" is translated in 1850; that of the Restoration is translated in the year of its appearance in France, and that twice; by 1853, further, it has appeared in Mexico. The *Histoire des Girondins* also comes out four times in Spanish in the year of its original publication; it is published the next year in Mexico, and is twice more translated into Spanish within the next six years.

The notices of Lamartine appearing in the Spanish press bear out the estimate of his influence in Spain which is suggested by the bibliography given above. In 1825 a writer in the *Ocios de Españoles emigrados,* which was published in London from 1824 to 1827, compares Heredia's poetry with the "tinte melancólico y severo de Mr. La Martine."[6] In the same year *Variedades,* Blanco White's organ, also published in London, prints a rather tardy review of the *Méditations poétiques.*[7] But both these writers were in a country where Lamartine was already known. Into Spain he penetrated less quickly.

[5] Though the complete translations did not appear till 1844 and 1846, it is worth placing on record that *El Español* (Nov. 14, 1835) published a fragment from the *Voyage en Orient* in the year of its first appearance in French.

[6] IV, 516.

[7] II, 218 ff. Lamartine and Casimir Delavigne appear to serve as a pretext for a lengthy article on contemporary literature in general, but Blanco White goes so far as to say: "La Martine es sin disputa el mejor de los poetas que hoy viven en Francia," to give three long selections from the *Méditations,* and to add a short appreciation of them.

It was the end of 1832 before the *Diario de Barcelona* published some translations, of which the best is a version of *Le Soir* (from the *Premières Méditations*). Of this the writer, speaking of Lamartine, says: "Ha sabido vestir los grandiosos conceptos del lírico francés con la enérgica naturalidad de Rioja y la sonora afluencia de León . . . un digno modelo de la profundidad, novedad y filosofía." [8]

Eugenio de Ochoa, writing in the *Artista* for 1835, shows a knowledge of the *Méditations* by quoting at length from Nodier's preface to the eleventh edition (Gosselin, 1824).[9] Fermin de la Puente in 1838 translates Lamartine's verses on the death of his only daughter, *Gethsemani, où la Mort de Julia,* and prints the translation in the *Revista andaluza* three years later.[10] In the *Revista española de ambos mundos* for 1853 there is a translation of Lamartine's *Graziella,*[11] which had first appeared in French in the preceding year. But the majority of these notices and single translations are belated; and most of the biographical and critical articles are not primarily concerned with Lamartine as a poet at all.[12]

The Lamartinian work of Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda should perhaps be cited as an exception, and though much of it belongs to a later period, she may well be mentioned at this point. In *El Español* for 1841 she published a translation [13] of Lamartine's *Bonaparte,* and this is re-published, not in its original form, but with certain emendations and additions, in her collected works (Madrid, Rivadeneyra, 1869, I, 29-34) as an "imitation" entitled *A la tumba de Napoleon en Santa Elena.* The opening stanzas are more correctly an exact translation,[14] and throughout

[8] *Diario de Barcelona,* Sept. 10, 1832, and Sept. 23, 1833.

[9] *Artista,* 1835, I, 86-90.

[10] *Revista andaluza,* 1841, pp. 431-7.

[11] I, 74-96; 203-224; 334-357.

[12] An unsigned article in the *Alhambra* (1839, II, 59-60) is typical when it speaks of him as one of the many "apóstoles populares de ideas útiles y generosos sentimientos."

[13] It had previously appeared in the *Alhambra* (published in Granada) for 1840, over the writer's pseudonym of "La Peregrina."

[14] Sobbre un escollo, por el mar batido,
Sur un écueil battu par la vague plaintive,

it would be more correct to term the poem (even in its emended form) a free translation than an imitation. The same translator's *Adios a la lira* (ed. cit., I, 266-8), however, is, as it professes to be, an imitation of Lamartine's *Adieux à la poésie,* which, like *Bonaparte,* is to be found in the *Nouvelles méditations;* and a final tribute [15] is her *Dedicación de la lira a Dios* (I, 387-391), which bears the subtitle "Composición inspirada por una bella invocación de Lamartine." This last probably owes its inspiration to the *Invocation* of the *Harmonies* rather than to the better-known poem of the same name which appeared in the *Premières méditations.* The resemblance is, in any case, one of theme and spirit, and not of letter or of form; la Avellaneda repeats and accentuates the tone of self-abasement, lengthening the poem, varying the metre, and making explicit what Lamartine's lines often only imply. Apart from these translations and imitations there is much in the religious inspiration of la Avellaneda's poetry which recalls Lamartine, though her debt to Victor Hugo,—even to Parny—could no doubt be shown to be equally great.

But whatever small success Lamartine attained to in Spain as a poet was very soon outshone by his reputation as a politician and a historian. The student may consult the review *El Pensamiento* (1848-9), which devotes more space to the poet than any other contemporary journal which I have seen. There are some translations entitled *Escenas d ela revolución francesa.*[16] Lamartine is "el poético historiador de los Girondinos," says an introduction, referring further to his published defense of his conduct, and sympathizing with his fall. There is no space, nor is it well,

El marinero desde lejos mira
De una tumba brillar la blanca piedra,
Y entre el verde tejido
De la zarza y la hiedra
Que unidas flotan en flexibles lazos,
Sobre la humilde losa se descubre . . . .
¡Un cetro hecho pedazos!

Le nautonier, de loin, voit blanchir sur la rive
Un tombeau près du bord pur les flots déposé;
Le temps n'a pas encore bruni l'étroite pierre,
Et sous le vert tissu de la ronce et du lierre
On distingue . . . . un sceptre brisé.

[15] Apart, that is, from various indications, such as epigraphs, which bear testimony to her study of Lamartine, *e. g.,* I, 60, 65, 93.

[16] El Pensamiento (in the British Museum), I, 17 ff. (Oct. 8, 1848.)

continues the note, to discuss the rights and wrongs of the matter; it is better to let Lamartine speak in his own defense. Then follows the extract referred to.

In the same journal, besides several short biographical and other notes,[17] there is an an article on *Raphaël,*[18]—"un libro bellísimo, . . . escrito con tal raudal de poesía, de pasión y de sentimiento, que os recuerda las bellas páginas de *Romeo y Julieta,* de *Pablo y Virginia,* o de *Lucia di Lammermoor.*" A summary of the argument and some long selections follow. Then the narrative suddenly stops short with the words: "O jamás libro alguno ha conmovido los corazones, o *Rafael* debe conmoverlos todos. Lamartine ha sembrado en él, a manos llenas, toda esa poesía admirable del cantor de las *Meditaciones* y de las *Armonías.*"

We may read also in this review a life of Lamartine,[19] which, though it gives full weight to the literary importance of the *Méditations* of 1820,—perhaps the first article in Spain to do so—is chiefly occupied with his political writings. There are in addition some selections from the *Confidences,*[20] and a translation from the *Voyage en Orient,* headed simply *Jerusalem.*[21] It is true that the *Confidences,* with *Raphaël,* only appeared in 1849, and that the writers responsible for these articles are, therefore, well abreast of the literary calendar. But the context suggests that the interest in the poems of Lamartine had arisen from that of the prose, rather than the prose from the poems, which one might have expected to have been the case. Any reader of the *Pensamiento* will see that the main interest of these notices, which are so prominent in it, is other than poetical.

It should be added, nevertheless, that Lamartine did eventually find his way, in a somewhat more worthy fashion than heretofore, into Spanish verse and the history of Spanish literature, partly through the work of la Avellaneda, and partly through a number of poets who flourished mainly in the decades 1860 to 1880. But it

[17] *Ibid.*, II, 31, 176 (Jan. 22, May 28, 1849): "Lamartine escribe en el día un poema titulado *Rafael* y *la Historia de la Revolución de 1848,* libro esperado con vivísima y justa impaciencia."

[18] *Ibid.*, II, 33-4.

[19] *Ibid.*, II, 41-2, 49, 50.

[20] *Ibid.*, II, 57-8.

[21] *Ibid.*, II, 105-7. The article has no explanation or account of its source.

will be realized on examination that these belated disciples are disciples almost by accident. Narciso Campillo (1838-1900), one of the foremost and first of them, translated Lamartine in the sixties, as he translated Victor Hugo and others, as part of the tribute to Romanticism paid by the Andalusian followers of Rivas and Zorrilla.[22] Teodoro Llorente (1836-1911), living at the other extreme of the peninsula, was a translator by predilection, and Lamartine shares the honors of his industry with Goethe, Longfellow, Schiller, Byron, Vigny, Gautier, Musset, and not less than a score of other eminent poets of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[23] There was, no doubt, something in Llorente's temperament which drew him to Lamartine, as there was, above all, in the temperament of Amos de Escalante (1831-1902),[24] in whose verses we have that very inspiration of religion which marks the best of the *Méditations,* and without prompting direct translations (for all are not translators) makes us recognize Lamartine continually. But such a case is intensely individual and demands separate treatment.[25]

E. Allison Peers.

The University of Liverpool.

[22] See *Poesías*, Sevilla, 1858, and Cadiz, 1867.

[23] Llorente's chief translations from Lamartine may be consulted in *Poetas franceses del siglo XIX* (Barcelona, Montaner y Simon) and in J. Navarro Reverter's *Teodoro Llorente, su vida y sus obras* (Barcelona, Granada y Cía). They are: *El Lago, La ventana de la casa paterna, El caracol de mar.*

Cf. the confession of his preference for Victor Hugo and Lamartine, cited by Navarro Reverter, *op. cit.*, p. 36. "Quería asimilarme la poesía del uno y del otro, y con este objeto, por pura fruición propia, sin ulterior propósito, dí en traducir sus versos. ¡Qué horas tan deliciosas, y a veces tan intranquilas, huyendo de las gentes, a solas conmigo mismo, pasé ocupado en aquella dificultosa labor! A nadie la daba a entender; temía que la profanasen ojos extraños."

[24] See *Poesías de D. Amos de Escalante, edición póstuma precedida de un estudio crítico por D. M. Menéndez y Pelayo* (Madrid, 1907).

[25] I have said nothing of Lamartine's influence on Juan Arolas, a subject which my friend Sr. Lomba y Pedraja has studied so completely in his work *El P. Arolas, su vida y sus versos*, Madrid, 1898. Here (pp. 125-135) he not only shows how Arolas both imitated and copied Lamartine, but also discussed at some length the respects in which he resembled, and those in which he fell short of him.

ERRORS IN BEAUCHAMPS' *RECHERCHES SUR LES THÉÂTRES DE FRANCE*

Despite the fact that Faguet seriously compromised the trustworthiness of his *Tragédie française au XVIe siècle* by the confidence he placed in the fictions of Mouhy's *Journal du théâtre français,* critics have not ceased to trust eighteenth-century works devoted to the history of the French stage. Even those who are wary of accepting a single date are apt to follow Beauchamps when he gives not only the date found on the title-page of a play, but also the dates of the *privilège* and *achevé d'imprimer.* An entry that reads "L'Argenis . . . in-8°. 1636. la veuve Bessin, achevée d'imprimer le 15. juin, priv. du 18. Avril"[1] certainly inspires confidence until one happens to consult the original edition of the play and learns that Beauchamps has set down 1636 for 1631. Then one asks whether such mistakes are common and to what extent this writer may be trusted.

To answer this question I compared the dates given by Beauchamps for 119 plays with those of the original editions and found him in error with regard to 19 plays or about 16 per cent. of the cases. Usually the mistakes are slight. Beauchamps gives the wrong day,[2] or the wrong month,[3] occasionally the wrong year.[4] When one consults the plays cited, one can see in some cases the source of his error. The *privilège* to print Guérin de Bouscal's *Suite de la Mort de César* was given on July 23, "1637 et de nostre règne le vingt-septième," a contradition, for, as Louis XIII

[1] *Recherches sur les théâtres de France,* Paris, Prault, 1735, II, 79.

[2] *Argénis et Poliarque, privilège,* Feb. 23 for 25; *Nitocris, priv.,* Nov. 20 for 10; *Victime d'Estat, priv.,* May 7 for 17; *Généreuse Allemande, achevé d'imprimer,* Nov. 18 for 8; Durval, *Panthée, ach.,* Feb. 22 for 12; *Persélide, ach.,* Aug. 13 for Aug. 1; *Inceste supposé, ach.,* Dec. 30 for 31; *Thémistocle, ach.,* March 10 for 20; *Anaxandre, ach.,* March 21 for 26.

[3] *Dom Quixote, priv.,* March for May; *Scévole, ach.,* June for January.

[4] *Suite de la Mort de César, priv.,* 1637 for 1636; *Mort de Mithridate, ach.,* 1637 for 1636; Puget de la Serre, *Martire de Sainte Catherine, priv.* and *ach.,* 1642 for 1643; Desmaretz, *Roxane, priv.,* May 13, 1647 for March 14, 1639, *ach.,* April 25, 1647 for the latter part of 1640; *Argénis, priv.* and *ach.,* 1636 for 1631; *Lysandre et Caliste, priv.* and *ach.,* July 2 and Aug. 5, 1636, for July 20 and Aug. 5, 1632; *Folies de Cardénio, priv.,* 1625 for 1629; Monléon, *Thyeste,* 1633 for 1638.

became king in May, 1610, the month of July, 1636, not 1637, fell in the twenty-seventh year of his reign. Moreover this *privilège* was transferred to Quinet on Jan. 16, 1637 and the *achevé d'imprimer* is dated Feb. 20 of the same year. Evidently the misprint lies in the first date, which contradicts the other three. If it is changed to 1636, there is no difficulty. The play is then seen to have preceded the *Cid* and hence to have more importance than if it had first appeared in 1637. Again, after dating Desmaretz's *Roxane* 1640, Beauchamps gives the *privilège* and *achevé d'imprimer* as of May 13 and April 25, 1647, confusing this play with the *Mort de Roxane* by "J. M. S.," whose *privilège* and *achevé d'imprimer* date from May 13, 1647 and April 25, 1648. As a matter of fact, the *privilège* of Desmaretz's *Roxane* was granted March 14, 1639. The play must have been printed between June 12, 1640, the day when the *privilège* was transferred to another publisher, and the end of the year.

Other mistakes are less obvious. I have referred to Du Ryer's *Argénis,* dated 1636 instead of 1631. Similar errors are found in the case of his *Lysandre et Caliste,* dated 1636 for 1632 and of Pichou's *Folies de Cardénio,* dated Aug. 20, 1625, instead of Aug. 20, 1629. Two leading authorities, Rigal [5] and Dannheisser,[6] have accepted the erroneous date for the latter play and thus given it an undue importance in the development of the French drama. Beauchamps is, however, less to blame here than elsewhere. He evidently got the date from an edition of the play printed by Targa at Paris in 1633 which gives Aug. 20, 1625 as the date of the *privilège.* He should have noticed that the document cited is not the *privilège* itself, but only an "extrait" from it. Had he examined the original edition, he would have found only the date Aug. 20, 1629.[7]

The dating of Monléon's *Thyeste* is less excusable. Beauchamps writes "in -4°. 1633. Paris, Guillemot, achevee d'imprimer le 9 août, priv. du 6." Copies in the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Widener Library of Harvard University, and the Library of the Comédie Française give exactly the same days of the same months,

[5] In Petit de Julleville's *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française,* IV, 226.

[6] "Zur Geschichte der Einheiten in Frankreich," *ZFSL.* 1892, p. 66.

[7] This is shown by a copy at the Bibliothèque Nationale examined for me by Dr. R. C. Williams, and by another in my possession.

but the year 1638.[8] The mistake is worth noticing, for if the play had been printed in 1633, it would appear to be the first of a group of seventeenth-century plays based on Seneca that includes Corneille's *Médée* and Rotrou's *Hercule mourant*. Moreover the play shows remarkable unity for the period, more than we find in the *Cid*, as much as is shown by Mairet's *Sophonisbe*, so that it might easily be considered to have more right than the latter to the title of the first French classical tragedy, for it is no mere adaptation of Seneca. In half the play the dramatization of the legend differs decidedly from Seneca's and Monléon improves upon his model in the use he makes of the queen and her children. But first published as it was in 1638, after Mairet, Corneille, Scudéry, Du Ryer, La Calprenède, Benserade had produced classical tragedies, it possesses little importance, except as an essay in the horrible and in the use of children on the stage, neither of which characteristics was to find many imitators in the seventeenth century.

Beauchamps's error has been very generally followed. The frères Parfaict (1745) date the play 1633.[9] The *Bibliothèque du théâtre françois*[10] gives the same date, as does Léris.[11] The

[8] This date is also given by Maupoint, *Bibliothèque des théâtres*, Paris, Prault, 1733, p. 299, who wrote too early to be influenced by Beauchamps. If the question is asked whether there may have been an edition of 1633 as well as of 1638, it may be answered that no copy of the earlier edition has been found, that the edition of 1638 is not called a second edition, that the only evidence for an edition of 1633 is given by authors who are directly or indirectly copying Beauchamps, and that the latter's date must be intended for 1638 unless we are willing to accept the remarkable coincidence that the *privilège* and *achevé* of this supposed edition were dated Aug. 6 and Aug. 9, 1633, while those of the extant edition are Aug 6. and Aug. 9, 1638.

[9] They, of course, do not attempt to give the date of printing, but the earliest date on which they think it had been completed by its author.

[10] Dresden, 1768. The authors of this work undoubtedly had an edition of the play in their hands, for their analysis of it enters into considerable detail and reports facts omitted by the frères Parfaict. Their error in the date can be explained by the fact that the plays owned by the duc de La Vallière, which are analyzed in this work, passed largely into the possession of the Arsenal Library and that the copy of the play found there contains no printed date on the title-page, but one written in ink, 1633, in spite of the fact that the *privilège* and *achevé* contained in the volume are dated 1638. Evidently the date in ink was copied from Beauchamps or the frères Parfaict and gave rise to the blunder of the editors of the *Bibliothèque du théâtre françois*.

[11] Edition of Paris, 1763, p. 427.

Anecdotes dramatiques (1775) give 1733, adding a typographical error of their own. Mouhy in his *Abrégé de l'histoire du théâtre françois,* II, 236, sets it down as a quarto of 1633, but elsewhere (I, 464) mentions an edition in octavo of that year and a quarto of 1638. He is evidently copying two authorities and trying to reconcile them. In Germany the error has been widely propagated. Lessing [12] writes, "Ausser diesem hat auch ein gewisser Montleon [*sic*] 1633 einen Thyest drucken lassen." H. Lüst, the only person who has printed a careful study of the play, follows his example.[13] A. L. Stiefel [14] uses the erroneous date and a piece of faulty reasoning to arrive at a probably correct result with regard to the dating of Rotrou's *Hercule mourant.* F. Jakob in a dissertation on the story of Atreus [15] quotes Léris to justify this date. Finally one of the principal French authorities in this field, the late Professor Rigal, not only accepts the date, 1633, in the article to which I have referred, but on account of it is obliged to explain at some length why he does not consider *Thyeste* the first French classical tragedy.[16]

These examples are sufficiently numerous to show how many errors may come from faith in Beauchamps's dates, even when he gives *privilège* and *achevé* d'imprimer. The plays I have examined are, of course, only a few of those cited in his *Recherches,* but the proportion of error would probably hold for the rest of the work. There is no evidence that he deliberately sought to deceive his readers, but either he or his publisher was so careless that he must always be consulted with caution and no chronological theory can be based on dates given in his book, unless they have been found also in the original editions of the plays.

H. Carrington Lancaster.

[12] *Sämtliche Schriften,* edition of K. Lachmann, Stuttgart, 1890, VI, 231. The context shows that Lessing is following Léris.

[13] *Monleon in seinem Thyeste als Nachahmer Senecas,* Schweinfurt, 1887, page 6.

[14] "Ueber die Chronologie von J. Rotrou's dramatischen Werken," *ZFSL.* 1894, XVI, 29.

[15] *Die Fabel von Atreus und Thyestes in den wichtigsten Tragödien der englischen, französischen und italienischen Literatur,* Naumburg a. S., 1906, pp. 4 and 25.

[16] *Op. cit.,* p. 252.

MILTON'S *LYCIDAS* AND THE PLAY OF *BARNAVELT*

Critics of Milton seem to be rather generally agreed that, however much the poet may have drawn upon the treasures of thought in the writers of both ancient and modern times, and however close in some instances the resemblances may be between the work of the lender and the borrower, Milton can in no case be charged with downright plagiarism—a word for word transplanting that is unaccompanied by the transforming power of the poet's imagination and individuality. It is generally agreed that Milton transformed into his own whatever he touched, and that almost without exception he transformed it into an infinitely better thing than he found it.

It is, therefore, a most arresting experience to come across a word for word parallel that apparently belies the statement that Milton was never a downright plagiarist. Such a parallel occurs between a passage in *Lycidas* and one in *The Tragedy of Sir John van Olden Barnavelt* by Massinger and Fletcher. Lines 70-72 of *Lycidas* run as follows:

> Fame is the spur that the clear spirit doth raise
> (That last infirmity of noble mind)
> To scorn delights and live laborious days.

In *Barnavelt,* Act I, scene 1 occurs the following speech of Barnavelt himself:

> Yf I fall
> I shall not be alone, for in my ruyns
> My Enemies shall find their Sepulchres.
> Modes-Bargen, though in place you are my equall,
> The fire of honor, which is dead in you,
> Burnes hotly in me, and I will preserve
> Each glory I have got, with as much care
> As I acheivd it. Read but ore the Stories
> Of men most fam'd for courage or for counsaile,
> And you shall find that the desire of glory
> (That last infirmity of noble minds)
> Was the last frailty wise men ere put of:
> Be they my presidents.[1]

[1] Bullen, *Old English Plays,* Vol. II, p. 213.

We have, then, in a context somewhat similar to that in *Barnavelt,* a line which, with the unimportant difference between "mind" and "minds," not only presents a word for word parallel, but even uses the parentheses. This double coincidence is, to say the least, very striking. The same sentiment, it has been noted, Milton expressed much later in *Paradise Regained,* Bk. III, lines 25 ff. Satan asks Christ why He should deprive himself of fame and glory

> . . . glory, the reward
> That sole excites to high attempts the flame
> Of most erected spirits, most tempered pure
> Aethereal, who all pleasures else despise,
> All treasures and all gain esteem as dross,
> And dignities and powers, all but the highest.

The resemblance between the *passages* in *Lycidas* and *Barnevelt* was noticed by Robert Boyle, who in Appendix II of Bullen's *Old English Plays* (Vol. II, p. 437) speaks in comment on the lines

> The desire of glory
> Was the last frailty wise men ere put off.

as follows: "This occurs again in *A Very Woman,* V, 4, line 10—

> Though the desire of fame be the last weakness
> Wise men put off.

Though the thought occurs in Tacitus and Simplicius, Milton seems to have adopted it, as he has done many other of his most striking passages from Massinger. It occurs also in at least one other play of Massinger's, but the passage has escaped me for the moment."

It is curious that Boyle should speak of the lines *preceding* and *following* the one in parentheses and not even hint at the much more striking parallel between the two lines thus identically set off. He was evidently not greatly concerned with more than the general resemblance of thought, if he was even aware of more.

We should expect editors and critics of Milton to have noticed the parallel. A careful examination, however, reveals no evidence that any commentator of Milton's *Lycidas* has even noticed the resemblance. It would of course not be noticed by Warton (1785), Todd (1826), Browne (1866), Masson (1874), Bradshaw (1877),

Jerram (1881), or the other editors before Jerram, since *Barnavelt* was never published until 1883, when it appeared in Vol. II of Bullen's *Old English Plays.* Since its publication, however, have appeared, among others, the editions of Verity (1898), Moody (1899), Sampson (1901), and Tuckwell (1911). In citing parallels or slight resemblances to the *Lycidas* line, many of these commentators merely quote from their predecessors. Altogether, from Warton to Tuckwell, we have citations from the following authors and works: Tacitus, Athenaeus, Abbate Grillo, Sir Henry Wotton, Bishop Hall, Feltham's *Resolves,* Jonson's *Cataline,* and Massinger's *A Very Woman.* But all of these furnish slight parallels indeed compared with the line from *Barnavelt.* It is thus evident that the parallel has not been mentioned where it should of all places be found—in the standard editions of *Lycidas.*

What, now, are the conceivable explanations of the parallel? *Lycidas* was written in the autumn of 1637 and published in 1638. *Barnavelt* was produced, according to Fleay, between August 14 and August 27, 1619. Sir John van Olden Barnavelt was executed May 13, 1619. The play was written, therefore, between May and August, 1619. There is no evidence of any subsequent production. The manuscript, a folio of thirty-one leaves, was purchased for the British Museum from the Earl of Denbigh in 1851 and is now entitled Brit. Mus. Add. Ms. 18, 653. Its history previous to the purchase in 1851 is unknown. It was first published by Bullen, as above indicated, in 1883. With these facts in mind, the four conceivable explanations of the parallel may be noted. First, that the parallel is a mere coincidence is not probable. Second, that both lines have a common source is more conceivable but still not very probable. Third, that Massinger copied Milton is not possible unless Massinger revised the play after 1638, and of this revision there is no evidence whatever. Fourth, that Milton copied Massinger is the most plausible explanation of all and, in the present state of our knowledge, the only acceptable one.

But, if we accept this last explanation, how did Milton get hold of the line from *Barnavelt?* In the absence of any known published version in Milton's time, he must either have seen the manuscript or witnessed the stage presentation. Accessibility to the manuscript would naturally, though not necessarily, require an acquaintanceship with one of the authors, and there is not the

slightest evidence, in Masson or anywhere else, that Milton had any relations with either Fletcher or Massinger. It is of course just possible that he may have had access to the manuscript through the medium of other persons. Our ignorance of the early history of the manuscript precludes our supporting or denying the supposition. But it would at least seem very improbable, considering Milton's slight relationship with the class of men who would be likely to have it in custody. The stage presentation he may possibly have known. But this is very improbable, since Milton was only eleven years old when *Barnavelt* was produced in 1619. And even conceding that he was allowed to frequent the theatres at this age, it is not very likely that he would have retained a line or a passage in his memory in this exact form from 1619 to 1637. The accessible commonplace books of his do not contain the line. And since we have no record of any subsequent production of the play, we must infer that he never saw it produced.

Finally, there is not the slightest allusion in Milton's poetry or prose to Barnavelt himself. The only allusion in his poetry to the political situation on the Continent that might be of significance occurs in the third Elegy, lines 10-11:

> Et memini Heroum quos vidit ad aethera raptos,
> Flevit et amissos Belgia tota duces.

But even this is of doubtful import. In short, as to Milton's knowledge of this particular play we have absolutely no evidence, and the parallel between *Lycidas* and *Barnavelt,* striking as it is, seems unexplainable in the light of the knowledge we now possess.[2]

Louis Wann.

University of Southern California.

---

[2] The larger question, which this parallel of course suggests, of Milton's connections with the dramatic literature of England demands much more investigation than it has hitherto received. An investigation of the writer's, undertaken in connection with the study here reported and including a very careful examination of Milton's prose and poetry for allusions to the English drama, has led him to conclude that Milton's connections with the dramatic literature of England were very slight, and that his relations to the theatre itself seem practically negligible.

A COMMENT ON MILTON'S *HISTORY OF BRITAIN*

Milton's theory of the distinction between liberty and license is conspicuous in his philosophy; it recurs again and again in his writings, for the marked Hebraic element in his nature lent itself freely to the utterance of maxim and jeremiad, of prophecy and lamentation. His abiding interest, too, in the doctrine that liberty must be guarded by temperance and virtue is, in a real sense, an aspect of his solicitude for human welfare. To become a sluggard in an hour of ease, or a voluptuary in an hour of affluence, or a tyrant in an hour of authority—these, he is convinced, are perils that never fail to beset the race of man. With the Puritan's consciousness that they are imminent in the career of an individual, he combines the scholar-poet's knowledge that all nations and ages are exposed to them. With the "great Task-Master's eye" looking upon him throughout the centuries, how is frail man withstanding the test?

In one form or another, this query always commanded a place in Milton's thought; not often, however, did it find better opportunity to present itself than in his *History of Britain*. In the three poems of his final years it is clearly manifest, and evident, though less plainly, in the early poetry. The prose writings reflect it in a measure, but no other so well as the *History*. For the productions of Milton's so-called second period, and the prose compositions of the third, were mainly polemic—tracts and treatises written to support personal or factional causes, and to disarm threatened or pending attacks. Virtually every one of them had its peculiar object, and a specific occasion. One need mention only *The Reason of Church Government* and the Smectymnuan documents in order to imagine himself in an atmosphere of special controversies and narrow issues. Even *Of Education* was the outgrowth of a current movement. In most of these writings, Milton had definite thrusts to deliver, or concrete assaults to resist. There was little scope for moral theses of broad and profound application. In the *History*, however, in which more than a thousand years of authentic records were spread before him, in which whole tribes and nations played the alternating roles of conqueror and conquered, and in which the triumph of virtue and the undoing of vice might be witnessed on a universal scale—in

such a work he could illustrate his precept without restraint. The closing paragraph,[1] with its admonition to contemporary Englishmen, goes far toward revealing the spirit in which he wrote. In the hands of a man of that contemplative, sober temper, the national annals could scarcely inspire an epic of legendary jousts and tourneys, or a glorification of towering and picturesque heroes, but prompted instead a stern warning, in unpretentious narrative, that the race protect its Heaven-sent freedom against the snares of earthly temptation.

The *History of Britain* therefore holds a unique place in the development of Milton's thought and character. To contend that the moral premises of *Paradise Lost* arose spontaneously out of it would be futile and absurd, for it is known that the project of an epic based on Adam's sin was engaging his mind as early as 1640, some five years before the composition of the *History* was actually begun. But his intense examination of the varied story of a people's fortunes, prosecuted as it was through the very period in which ideas for the master-work were germinating and flowering, must have been a powerful influence. Had Milton never undertaken a history of England, he would still have written his last three poems; yet the lesser interest surely had its effect on the eventual preservation of the greater. From the spectacle of a nation's combat with sin it was only a step to the panorama comprising humanity and the Cosmos. When, after 1655, he was somewhat free to focus his thought on the composition of *Paradise Lost,* he had finished nearly four books of the historical work. He had already meditated upon the self-imposed fate of the Britons: he was about to compare it with the similar doom of their Teutonic successors. During the following half-decade, the writing of the two works made joint claim upon his time. For over fifteen years, moreover, through violent interruptions and absorbing activities, through failing vision and total blindness, he bore them in his mind side by side. Seed-thoughts and suggestions for the one must have had their share in shaping and coloring the other.

[1] The passage follows: "If these were the causes of such misery and thraldom to those our ancestors, with what better close can be concluded, than here in fit season to remember this age in the midst of her security, to fear from like vices without amendment, the revolution of like calamities?" This passage was doubtless written shortly after the Restoration.

It is presumptuous, of course, to contend that the author of the *History* is at all points the man who sang the strains of *Paradise Lost*. The irritable, combative, and excessively subjective nature gave way, in the presence of a divine theme, to the tranquil seer. Yet in both there is the same search after moral truth, the same endeavor to know the spiritual worth of human character, and its final hope in the conflict with temptation; and there is the same high purpose to

justify the ways of God to men.

HARRY GLICKSMAN.

University of Wisconsin.

KEATS'S *ODE TO THE NIGHTINGALE*

The revival of interest in Keats with the centennial of his death has brought out much interesting new material, but nothing of more value than that on the *Ode to the Nightingale*. Sir Sidney Colvin's publication of a facsimile of the manuscript of the poem, the property of the Marquis of Crewe, has furnished an invaluable addition to the materials for the study of this poem, acknowledged to be one of the poet's greatest.

The facsimile shows that Brown's "four or five" scraps of paper upon which he said the poem was written are in reality only two scraps, but with four pages, and also disposes of any lingering doubt about the proper arrangement of the stanzas. This enables us now to speak more confidently about both the thought and imagery of the poem, and to see it as a consistent whole, which up to the present has been somewhat uncertain.

In the matter of the imagery of the poem, it needs to be noticed that there are two and only two distinct images, though this has not been noticed by students of Keats generally. The first and last stanzas, though clearly introductory and concluding in their thought, do not constitute separate images.

The first image of the poem is that of the actual conditions under which Keats composed the poem, transferred directly and only made more vivid by his creative imagination. The poet, as

Brown relates, "one morning took his chair from the breakfast table to the grass plot under a plum-tree, where he sat for two or three hours," listening to the nightingale that had made her nest near the house. Here Keats listened and wrote, and at the end of the two or three hours had completed the poem. As Sir Sidney Colvin suggests, this rather than Hayden's is probably the true account of the composition of the poem.

The imagery, then, is of the summer morning hours, probably mid-May (l. 48), and the poet addresses the nightingale under this form. Hancock has totally misconceived the poem, for he states explicitly as a summary of the first stanza that "It is night,"[1] and presumably thinks the same image continues in the succeeding stanzas.

Nor has the thought of these stanzas been clearly understood. Hancock says, summarizing the thought of the first stanza: "The song of the nightingale has stirred the poet to a mood of rapture almost intoxicating. He is, for the moment, happy beyond man's common privilege." On the contrary, the mood throughout this and the following stanzas is that of the aching heart and drowsy numbness that pains his sense. He does not participate in the happiness of the nightingale, nor does he envy it, but is pained at the contrast between its happiness and his own unhappiness.

Then, instead of desiring a continuance of this rapture, as Hancock thinks, in the second stanza the poet desires wine that he may rid himself of his unhappiness and become happy like the bird. Wine, he thinks, would enable him to "fade away" with the nightingale "into the forest dim" where he could forget his unhappiness, or, as he puts it, "The weariness, the fever, and the fret" that are the lot of those who live where palsy and death wait upon men.

The third stanza, then, does not "admonish the nightingale to escape wholly from this melancholy world," as Hancock wrongly says, but repeats the poet's desire, expressed in the last lines of the second, to "fade far away" with the bird where he can forget his own sorrows in its happiness.

With the opening of the fourth stanza the second image of the poem is employed. The wish to partake of wine to carry him away

[1] *John Keats, A Literary Biography*, 1908.

was only a passing fancy, and now gives place to his real thought, which is to "fade away," as he says, "on the viewless wings of Poesy." Now he will betake himself to imagination to get away from his sorrows, and in a moment (l. 35) he is in the world of his fancy.

With this the imagery changes, as has not been sufficiently clear to most writers, and he passes from the imagery of summer morning to that of "night" (l. 35), though it is still "mid-May." The poet has made his transition abundantly clear in the poem, to those who will take notice. In line 36 he speaks of "the Queen-Moon"; in 37 of the "starry Fays"; in 38 he says there is "no light"; in 41 he mentions that he "cannot see the flowers"; and in 43 he speaks of the "darkness." In the first line of stanza VI (l. 51) he says: "Darkling I listen"; in 56 he speaks of "midnight"; in 63 he refers to "this passing night."

The poet has thus repeated and reiterated all in vain that this second image is of the darkness and the night, and indeed of the midnight, though under the shining moon. He chooses the image of the night, no doubt, and reiterates it, for, though the nightingale sings in the mornings as he himself heard it, it is the night that has always seemed appropriate to the bird, and that must be conceived as its special world.

The last word of the seventh stanza, "forlorn," lingers in his mind and he repeats it as the first word of the eighth or last stanza. This brings him back to himself, and dispels the dark night of his fancy wherein he dwelt with the nightingale in "the forest dim," and where during the continuance of his imagination he was free from "the weariness, the fever, and the fret" of life. Then he wonders whether it has not all been "a vision, or a waking dream," and whether "Do I wake or sleep?"

Some of the more careful recent writers have not overlooked entirely the change from the "day" of the first to the "night" of the second image, but have not observed in this any special significance. Sir Henry Newbolt mentions the "embalmed darkness," but makes nothing of the fact (*A New Study of Poetry*, 1917). Sir Sidney Colvin, in his new life of Keats (1917) likewise mentions, but only casually, "the darkness," as of no special consequence. Most other writers, including Hancock, ignore en-

tirely the oft-repeated "night," and all alike miss thereby much of the deeper meaning of the poem.

In the first division of the poem (stanzas i-iii) the poet, after first stating the fact of his sorrow, expresses the strong desire to be transported beyond it all, as he poetically puts it, by "a draught of vintage." The sorrow of his brother's death had clouded his life and driven out all happiness. The happiness of the nightingale put his own unhappiness in stronger light, and made it appear greater by contrast. From it all he desires to get relief by fading away to the happy world of the nightingale.

Keats at this time was in great sorrow over the death of his brother Tom, who had died on December the first, only a few weeks before. He had seen Tom suffer, and had nursed him through the horrors of a consumptive's lingering sickness and death, "Where youth grows pale, and spectre-thin, and dies," and had had some intimations that he himself was following fast in the same way. This in itself would be sufficient to justify his sorrows, and put himself in deep contrast to the exultant happiness of the nightingale.

In addition to this, however, Keats had a deeper and more spiritual cause of unhappiness. No doubt Tom's death had contributed to bring it about, but Keats was now in the mood Wordsworth speaks of in *Tintern Abbey* as "the burden of the mystery," and as "the heavy and the weary weight of all this unintelligible world." Keats was now passing from the stage of the youthful poet and lover of beauty to the philosophic age in which he was no longer content merely to enjoy and glory in the fulness of life and the unimpaired beauty of the world as seen through his poetic imagination. His development had been exceedingly rapid, and he had passed almost unobserved even by his friends from the poet to the philosopher, but not without knowing it well himself.

A recent very illuminating paper calls attention to the fact that in the spring of 1819, when this and other poems were composed, Keats was passing through a sharp crisis in the life of the spirit.[2] He had, no doubt, been greatly influenced by Wordsworth and Coleridge, both of whom were philosophical poets, who had under-

[2] "The Real Tragedy of Keats," by G. R. Elliott. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, September, 1921.

gone similar crises in their poetic and spiritual development. As a consequence of this crisis Keats was no longer satisfied with the brilliant but æsthetic achievements of his poetry to date. Keats knew himself to be turning philosopher, and welcomed the change, but the change came about only with great heaviness of spirit. He willingly gave up the poetic innocence of his youth for the more profound mystery of life that came with the philosophic mind, but, like the Ancient Mariner's Wedding-Guest, he became not only a wiser but a sadder man.

As much as a year before this (April, 1818), he gave evidence of a spiritual struggle over the question of poetry and philosophy, and concluded, as he says in a letter to Taylor (24 April, 1818) to "turn all my soul to the latter," that is, to philosophy. The crisis was reached at the time of the composition of *Lamia,* a few months after the *Ode to the Nightingale,* in the summer of 1819, and then he settled once for all his attitude to philosophy. He concluded that though philosophy did rob the earth of some of its poetic charm and beauty, nevertheless, truth was better and was to be sought at all hazard.

The second image of the *Ode,* that of the nightingale in its forest darkness, may now be seen to have a deep significance. Its most obvious meaning is that Keats loved the quiet and the stillness, and even the darkness of the night more than the gaudy day. Keats was essentially a poet of repose and quiet. In *Endymion* he says, sympathetically:

> But the crown
> Of all my life was utmost quietude. (Book III.)

No poet has ever been more a worshipper of the Queen-Moon and the Night than the author of *Endymion.* He loved it not merely as a physical experience, but it was also symbolic of the hunger of his spirit for quietness and calm. Though city-born, London delighted him no more than it did Wordsworth, and Hampstead was a quiet relief to his tired spirit. He delighted in such imagery as that in his own *Ode on a Grecian Urn,* for there he could see the "bride of quietness," and could enjoy the "unheard melodies," which are sweeter. It is surprising the number of references in his poems and letters to the delights of quietness. His spirit seemed to long for quietness and silence.

The deeper thought, however, is that Keats had begun to feel that his life and work were rapidly closing, and leaving an unfulfilled ideal of poetic work. But he was becoming reconciled to this, and said he was "half in love with easeful Death." Under these conditions he almost wishes to die. In the sonnet on *Why did I laugh to-night* he spoke of midnight as a fitting time to die, and said: "Yet would I on this very midnight cease." It is under similar conditions in the *Ode* that he thinks he could give up his "quiet breath," for

> Now more than ever seems it rich to die,
> To cease upon the midnight with no pain.

He thinks the quiet of the midnight hour the most fitting time to die, when the nightingale is pouring forth its soul "In such an ecstacy." Never was a fond wish more completely denied suffering humanity, for Keats breathed his last in the arms of Severn almost at high noon.

Passing on, the poet contrasts the immortality of the nightingale's song, the same song having been heard by Ruth, with the transitoriness of human life and of his own song. By implication he desires personal immortality, as he had said directly in his letters. And he had earnestly hoped and labored to attain poetic immortality. But this bright hope, like the voice of the nightingale, passes away, and the world comes back upon him with "the weariness, the fever, and the fret," as before.

Keats, then, in this poem has revealed himself, and has shown not only his changing attitude of mind, but has given us a brief though all-important chapter in the history of his spirit, and at the same time a glimpse into his view of human life and of death.

A. W. Crawford.

University of Manitoba.

Immermann. Der Mann und sein Werk im Rahmen der Zeit- und Literaturgeschichte. Von HARRY MAYNC. München, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1921. 627 pp.

Die Heidelberger Romantik. Von HERBERT LEVIN. München, Verlag Parcus & Co., 1922. 153 pp.

Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im Spiegel der nationalen Entwickelung von 1813-1918. Von WILHELM KOSCH. München, Verlag Parcus & Co., 1922. 44 pp.

Wieland's Attitude toward Woman and her Cultural and Social Relations. By MATTHEW G. BACH. New York, The Columbia University Press, 1922. 100 pp.

We have to do here with the most inclusive and ramifying biography that has ever been written of a German poet, the most detailed invoice thus far drawn up of the facts connected with what is conveniently known as Heidelberg romanticism as distinguished from that of Jena and Berlin, the beginnings[1] of the most patriotic history of German literature within the period to be covered, and a quite typical and certainly not contemptible American dissertation. If the last work seems out of place in this composite review, I hasten to add that I am interested here, not merely in the ideas the authors elaborate and the ingenuity they display in framing their investigations, but also, and rather, in these four works as so many distinct types of scholarship in German. But should even this appeal to anyone as an inadequate reason for the inclusion of a treatise on Wieland, it may be said in further defence that he too was a romanticist—just as Wolfram von Eschenbach was, or Rainer Maria Rilke and Gerhart Hauptmann may be. If, moreover, there was one German writer during the first half of the last century more than another who was sympathetically familiar with such works of Wieland as *Agathon* and *Don Sylvio von Rosalva* it was Karl Immermann.

[1] This is merely the first *Lieferung* of Kosch's projected work. There are to be three volumes in all. The first is to treat German literature from 1813 to 1848, and will be divided into fifty sections of which this *Lieferung* contains the first two: "Arndt und Schenkendorf" and "Die alte deutsche Burschenschaft."

Mayne's great life of Immermann opens afresh the Immermann problem. As a writer of fiction he is dead with the exception of *Der Oberhof,* a work he never wrote, in actuality, and which, in the opinion of many students, should never have been amputated from *Münchhausen* and published separately. As a critic, a writer of travel sketches and history he never quite reached a high degree of perfection. But a great mass [2] of material has been written on him, particularly in comparison with the meagre studies we have of German poets of superior distinction, or at least of greater innate gifts.

The Hempel edition of Immermann, edited by Boxberger, contains 88 pages of biographical matter apart from detailed introductions to each of his separate works. Max Koch did Immermann full justice in the four-volume edition in the *Deutsche National-Literatur* series. Franz Muncker adopted the same scheme in the Cotta edition of six volumes. Werner Deetjen edited him in three large volumes, *Deutsches Verlagshaus Bong,* and Mayne himself said, one would have thought, the last word in his edition of five volumes, *Bibliographisches Institut.* Of the monographs that have been written on Immermann there is no end, for more are still to come.[3] And a possible piece of work would be a study in the development of editing *Der Oberhof.*[4]

[2] A complete list of the studies on Immermann can be had from Mayne's biography, pp. 595-597; *Karl Lebrecht Immermann* by the present writer, pp. 142-147, and an article in *Modern Language Notes,* Vol. XXVIII, No. 1. The *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* of March-April, 1922, contains an article by Joseph Risse, entitled "Immermann und die neuere Forschung" which brings the subject up to date.

[3] Of the works that are promised on Immermann, Harry Mayne is at present engaged on a complete commentary to *Münchhausen.* It will be recalled that Ferdinand Freiligrath was asked to write this nearly three-quarters of a century ago, when the allusions were still fresh, but declined on the ground of inability. The late Richard M. Meyer also had in mind the compiling, or composing, of such a work. The Immermann Mss. now in the Stadtbibliothek at Dortmund are to be edited by Joseph Risse, who even speaks, in Goethean language, of the joy he is experiencing as a result of having unearthed the *Ur-Alexis.*

[4] Two new editions of *Der Oberhof* have just appeared: (a) *Der Oberhof. Erzählung. Mit einer Einführung von* Prof. Dr. Viktor Kubelka. Reichenberg, Gebr. Stiepel, 1921. 383 pp. (b) *Der Oberhof. Die Geschichte eines westfälischen Hofes. Eingeleitet und herausgegeben von* Fritz Budde. Dortmund, Gebr. Lensing, 1922. 242 pp.

It is a queer case from the American[5] point of view, for, to repeat, Immermann is dead. In 1918, Friedrich Kayssler revived his *Merlin* on the *Volksbühne* in Berlin. He expended much energy and displayed sound artistic taste, but he did not prove that *Merlin* is a work that has been accorded step-motherly treatment by the German *Intendanten.* Last year, Albert Ziegler's *Die schelmische Gräfin,* a musical comedy, was played at the Statdttheater in Heidelberg.[6] These are the outstanding attempts made within recent years to breathe the breath of life into Immermann's creations. They failed.

Yet Maync wrote this book and found a publisher for it. Its unique and great value lies in what is connoted by the latter part of the title: *im Rahmen der Zeit- und Literaturgeschichte.* Everything Immermann did is shown in its relation to similar efforts on the part of other writers. There are 28 detailed references to Gottfried Keller. Why? Because Immermann was influenced by Keller? This is chronologically impossible. Because Keller was influenced by Immermann? It sounds absurd. But Maync has conjured up much evidence. There is, for example, the case of *Tulifäntchen* and *Der Apotheker von Chamounix.*

Maync throws, however, no light on Immermann's relation to the law. That Immermann did an almost inexplicable amount of work in the field of art and letters is generally known. How assiduously did he attend to his law practice? If he really worked hard at it, he was in turn a prodigy, a model and a marvel. I have my serious doubts on the subject. I have long had the same doubts with regard to E. T. A. Hoffmann. Two monographs I should like to see written are "Judge Immermann" and "Judge Hoffmann."

The long analyses of Immermann's works are not to be commended: they are unenlightening. You do not derive a clear picture of an Immermann epic or drama by reading the "contents" of it canto by canto or act by act. This blight on the book

[5] We would regard the life of Immermann by Gustav zu Putlitz, 2 volumes, 1870, as adequate.

[6] Cf. *Basler Nachrichten* in successive numbers during the month of April, 1921. The libretto was written by Paula Wolf-Stöhr. Immermann wrote *Die schelmische Gräfin* in 1825. He did not include it in his *Schriften,* Düsseldorf, 1835-1843.

is a legacy from Düntzer and Bulthaupt. No one can estimate the harm they did by their *Inhaltsangaben*. There are but few men who can give the "story" of a work in a really helpful way. The late Calvin Thomas was one of them.

This is a type of scholarship such as we cannot produce in this country; for we could never persuade an American scholar to spend twenty years of unrelieved labor on the life of a single individual, as Maync did here. But such a study would be extremely illuminating if Longfellow or Whitman or Poe or even Clyde Fitch were its theme.

Levin's *Heidelberger Romantik*[7] passes over in significant silence the works of Haym, Huch, Houben, Heine, Walzel, Brandes and the other general treatises; but it contains photographs and other illustrations in the way of reproductions of old etchings and city plans. It proceeds on the basis of Eichendorff's noted *mot, Heidelberg ist selbst eine prächtige Romantik;* but it aims to tell the precise day, and in some instances even the hour, on which those who made up the Heidelberg group arrived in the city on the Neckar. After considerable research, Levin has found, for example, that Heinrich Graf von Loeben came to Heidelberg on May 19, 1807 (p. 80). The Eichendorff brothers returned to Heidelberg, after their epoch-making visit to Paris, on May 4, 1808 (p. 83). The dates on which magazines were founded, courses on literature and philosophy were begun at the University, and new books were published are given with equal precision. The opening chapter, entitled *Voraussetzungen und Anfänge*, is devoted to the faculty of the University at the beginning of the century, the subjects on which they lectured, the number of students they had and similar details such as can always be assembled if the sources are accessible and the requisite diligence is not wanting. The photographs show the houses in which the outstanding figures of the time, Voss, Arnim, Brentano and others lived while there. There is a particularly good reproduction of the building in which

[7] As a study in contrasts, Josef Nadler's *Die Berliner Romantik: 1800-1814. Ein Beitrag zur gemeinvölkischen Frage: Renaissance, Romantik, Restauration* (Berlin: Erich Reiss, 235 pp.) cannot be passed over. Nadler's preface, entitled *Vorschuss an meine Scherbenrichter*, shows him to have been in an ugly humor when he wrote the book. We become cautious, too, when he accuses (p. 75) Rudolf Haym of *banale Plattheiten*. But he has rendered a distinct service to the study of romanticism.

Des Knaben Wunderhorn was conceived and partly carried out. And the elaborate city plan at the close of the volume locates all of the spiritual centers with the faithfulness of an up-to-date Baedeker. The last legend attached to the plan reads: *Das Boisseréehaus in der Hauptstrasse ist links gerade abgeschnitten.* The words were manifestly written with emotional regret.

There is a tendency, not merely in this country but also in Germany, to take an indifferent if not directly hostile attitude toward investigations of this type. The attitude is ill founded. Levin has made it easy to study and appreciate five important episodes or institutions in the history of German literature: the united efforts of the Boisserées to revive Old German art; the genesis and completion of the *Wunderhorn*; the Grimm *Märchen*; the *Deutsche Sagen*; and the ever memorable Voss feud. A work of more scrupulous research has never come to my notice. And it contains only twice (pages 72 and 98) that philological "exit" so common to studies of this kind: *man geht wohl nicht fern, wenn man annimmt.* If Levin were now to turn his all-seeing eye on Berlin romanticism, and Nadler were to apply his principles to Heidelberg romanticism, there would be but little more to write: it would be time to read.

As to the type of scholarship Levin has indulged in, from our point of view, it is important to note that the publication of his study was made possible by the *Corps-Suevia* at Heidelberg. Of the twenty odd *Corps* at Heidelberg, *Suevia*[8] is the oldest: it was founded on March 27, 1810, and consisted at first of 34 members. We think of these German *Corps* only in the terms of *Mensur* and *Schmisse, Rausch, Junkertum* and so on. But when will one of the fraternities in some one of the New England colleges stand morally and financially responsible for the publication of some such treatise as "The Brook Farm Experiment; or Transcendentalism in Action"?

Students of German in this country are familiar with Wilhelm Kosch as editor of the works of Eichendorff.[9] That Kosch dis-

[8] Cf. "Das Corpsleben in Heidelberg während des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts." This *Festschrift* was published at Heidelberg in 1886, apropos of the five hundredth anniversary of the University.

[9] Vols. 3, 10, 11, 12 and 13 had appeared at the outbreak of the war. Excellent, even a bit elegant in make-up, and edited in collaboration with

played the temperament of the scholar; this one reveals the state of mind into which a scholar is apt to fall subsequent to the fall of his country. Kosch states in this history of German literature (p. 26) quite unequivocally that Germany could never have risen after the Napoleonic wars had it not been for the romanticists. Now he feels that the teachings of the romanticists have a special message; that the re-reading of them with a mind single to their theories of nationalism will again enable Germany to rise and go forth among the nations of the world.

Regarding histories of German literature in general, I subscribe with reservations to the statement made by Jakob Wassermann in his quasi-autobiography, *Mein Weg als Deutscher und Jude.* Wassermann contends[10] that the incessant outpouring of histories of German literature is "a German disgrace and one that has made Germany look ridiculous in the eyes of cultured nations." It *is* an unhealthy state of affairs. It resembles, somewhat, the fever for editing texts that raged in the United States previous to the war but which, happily and fortunately, has been stopped by the war. We wince at times at the college president who insists on a Ph. D. to teach his German; there was formerly equal ground to feel queer about the authority who would recommend for promotion a member of the German department on the ground that he had edited a text—*Wilhelm Tell* or *Immensee*—and thereby signed his name to the work of an undisputed genius, but somewhat as a naughty schoolboy might chalk his to the base of a monument of a national hero by a reputed sculptor.

This charge, substantiated or imagined, cannot be preferred against Kosch; he is treating German literature from a relatively novel and certainly exclusive angle, that of patriotism. In his preface, written in the *Polterton* of Ernst Moritz Arndt at his fiercest, he speaks of the *verblendete Tore* who believed that they

a number of redoubtable German scholars, such as August Sauer, the edition bade fair to become one of the best. Whether the remaining volumes have appeared, I confess that I do not know. The first five were published by J. Habbel at Regensburg.

[10] Wassermann writes: "Die Massenheerschau und Massenabschlachtung eines Grossteils dieser wissenschaftlich tuenden Literaturgeschichten mit ihrer leichtsinnigen Schablonisierung und dem auf Unwissende und Unmündige berechneten Oberlehrererton ist geradezu eine deutsche Schande, in den Augen gebildeter Nationen eine Lächerlichkeit."

could dispense with the ideals of the romanticists at their most patriotic, *und so schloss der Taumel mit einem grausen Erwachen.* He refers to 1914. He has glorified Arndt as he has rarely been glorified before. And it is amazing what an anthology of flag-waving, even sabre-rattling observations can be culled from Arndt's works. The same applies, in a sense, to Schenkendorf. He has made conspicuous use of that adjective of which Adolf Bartels is so fond, *völkisch,* and equally frequent use of that really admirable noun brought into prominence during the late war, *Ertüchtigung.* And when through with Arndt and Schenkendorf, he concludes that *Deutsch ist gerecht.*

Then he goes over to the *Burschenschaften,* a theme on which much indeed has been written.[11] He discusses the introduction of the *Abiturientenexamen* (1788) and its effect on the standing of the students, traces the development of the term *Burschenschaft* from the middle of the eighteenth century, shows its relation to the *Corps,* gives the history of the *Burschenschaften* in the various universities, and even claims (p. 30), that Immermann's quarrel with them gave the nation after all *ein bedeutender Schriftsteller.* That is a distinctly ingenious explanation of such greatness as Immermann may have displayed, but Kosch is endeavoring to show the power of patriotism in poetry. Well, some rather prominent German poets have been *Burschenschaftler:* Hauff in Tübingen, Hoffmann von Fallersleben in Bonn, Holtei and Graf Strachwitz in Breslau, Lenau and Scheffel in Heidelberg, Dreves and Reuter in Jena. Omitted from this list are to be sure many great poets, but when Kosch attempts to prove that the Frankfurt Parliament of 1848 and the German Empire of 1871 are the fruits of the *Burschenschaften,* he is obliged to single out such poets as participated in them, including a Dreves and a Holtei. But can a scholar write with objective detachment when interested exclusively in patriotism? A book however entitled "A National Interpretation of American Literature" would have exceeding great value: it might make Americanization at once easier and more intelligent.

The German department at Columbia has been inclined recently

[11] Cf. *Hundert Jahre deutscher Burschenschaft, burschenschaftliche Lebensläufe.* Herausgegeben von Hermann Haupt und Paul Wentzcke. Heidelberg, 1921.

to use quite elaborate themes for its dissertations. Last year Lambert A. Shears published *The Influence of Walter Scott on the Novels of Theodor Fontane.* It is a gigantic theme. Fontane wrote much, Scott more. To read both of them for the purpose of preparatory orientation—and I am quite unable to see how a writer can be used as the basis of a doctoral dissertation unless every available word he wrote has been read — would certainly require two years.[12] Matthew G. Bach now writes on Wieland, a voluminous, scribacious individual whose works, even in that frayed old edition of Gruber (Göschen, 1826) make up more than a five-foot shelf of books.

Dr. Bach is categorical: he contends that Wieland, apart from his affair with Christiane Hagel, in which, we are told, he was not wholly to blame, lived a life beyond reproach; that he did much to elevate the position of woman in Germany; that he had but slight regard for a man who did not have a high regard for woman; and that he is morally in a class about with Tennyson. This latter thesis Dr. Bach does not explicitly posit. But he does more: he quotes Tennyson by way of comparison. His entire argument is built up on the assumption that if Wieland introduced salacious material or shady women characters into his works, it was to demonstrate the danger and horror of such, and not to commend the one as a befitting theme on which to meditate, or to uphold the other as a laudable type with which to associate.

This is ingenious; and it is charitable. But it placed Matthew G. Bach as a doctor *in spe* under tremendous obligations. It makes assumptions impossible, and partial investigations nefarious. Dr. Bach cannot afford to write as though he were championing the

[12] Dr. Shears's dissertation bears externally much similarity to Dr. Bach's in that the text is not voluminous, however elaborate the bibliography may be. But I am in no way contending that it is not a valuable piece of work: it recapitulates well, and goes slightly beyond the recapitulatory stage in that it offers reasonable proof that Fontane was influenced by Scott in ways that have heretofore not been shown. I feel, however, that some of his argument is halting. Regarding the fire in *Grete Minde* for example, Dr. Shears finds a similarity between this and the fire in *Ivanhoe.* But Jakob Wassermann has a scene quite similar to both in his "Das Gänsemännchen." Are we to assume that Wassermann read both Scott and Fontane? Are not fires rather common everywhere, and is there not always someone on hand to act in an imbecile way?

affirmative of a debate on the question: *Resolved, that C. M. Wieland was demure as a man, and of Victorian delicacy and chastity as a poet.* Or, if he writes in this mood, he should consider every word Wieland wrote. For Wieland betrayed his attitude toward women and morals in general even in his translation of Shakespeare, and certainly as much in such works as *Idris und Zenide,*[13] and *Ueber die Behauptung, dasz ungehemmte Ausbildung der menschlichen Gattung nachtheilig sey*[14] as in some of the works Dr. Bach selects for special examination.

But this remains a good piece of scholarship as conceived, and rightly practiced, in this country: it is largely our business to study, edit and lecture on what the Germans create. Dr. Bach writes 90 small pages (Columbia dissertations were 200 large pages in length before the war) rather heavily documented with quotations, and then appends a "selected" bibliography of 60 works on the same subject. This is typical. During the last hundred years of German teaching in the United States, the instances in which American scholarship in German has advanced beyond the recapitulatory stage have been not negligible but few. And to recapitulate in such a way that a Wieland, said by some German scholars "to have totally seduced and poisoned the German people," seems overdue for canonization is assuredly not a disservice—provided the point has been made; provided Dr. Bach has examined all the evidence.[15] I should like to think that he has.

ALLEN W. PORTERFIELD.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

---

[13] Vol. VII of the Mauermann edition: Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1911, pp. 18-156.

[14] The same, pp. 417-438.

[15] Dr. Bach has very kindly placed at my disposal a letter he received from Franz Muncker of Munich regarding his dissertation. Professor Muncker, after praising Dr. Bach's work in high tones, writes: "Es wird Sie wohl interessieren zu hören, dass in der sächsischen Landbibliothek zu Dresden ein dicker Band von Wielands Briefwechsel mit verschiedenen Damen (handschriftlich) liegt, der für Sie natürlich manchen Aufschluss geboten hätte." Precisely: this inaccessible material might be invaluable. Who knows? Dr. Bach should have known.

The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature before 1700. By Geoffroy Atkinson, Ph. D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1920. xiii + 185 pp.—*The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature from 1700 to 1720.* By Geoffroy Atkinson, Ph. D. Paris: Champion, 1922. 147 pp.

De la masse considérable de récits de voyages plus ou moins authentiques, de voyages purement imaginaires et fantastiques, de romans utopiques à tendances philosophiques ou déjà socialistes qui ont paru au dix-septième siècle, M. Atkinson a détaché et choisi pour sujet de son étude un groupe d'ouvrages auxquels il applique le terme de "voyages extraordinaires." Bien que M. Atkinson ait emprunté cette appellation à M. Lanson, il est bon de remarquer qu'il prend le mot voyage au sens strictement anglais de voyage par mer et qu'il exclut "les relations de voyages dans les autres planètes, les voyages faits en rêve, par des moyens magiques, des charmes ou des procédés surnaturels" (p. ix). Les voyages extraordinaires seront donc des voyages faits par mer, dans des pays qui existent, mais sont mal connus; ils contiennent une description de l'heureuse société que l'on y trouve et une relation du retour des voyageurs en Europe. Il y a quelque danger à prendre ainsi dans une acception purement anglaise un terme qui existe en français avec un sens beaucoup plus compréhensif, surtout quand il s'agit d'étudier un groupe d'ouvrages purement français. Si M. Atkinson poursuit son étude à travers le dix-huitième siècle, comme nous avons lieu de l'espérer, il se trouvera plus d'une fois embarrassé et sera forcé d'exclure des œuvres importantes qui ne répondent que de très loin à sa définition. Ces réserves faites, on peut à la rigueur classer sous le titre de voyages extraordinaires une combinaison du roman d'aventures et du roman utopique opérée vers la fin du dix-septième siècle sous l'influence des relations authentiques de voyages.

Le groupe ainsi délimité par M. Atkinson comprend trois "voyages extraordinaires" principaux: *La Terre australe connue* de Gabriel de Foigny, 1676; *l'Histoire des Sevarambes* de Denis de Vairasse d'Alais, 1677-79; les *Aventures de Télémaque* de Fénelon, 1699, qui tous trois présentent des descriptions d'une société idéale, encadrées de récits d'aventures qui nous sont données comme authentiques.

Avant de les analyser en détail, M. Atkinson a consacré trois chapitres sommaires, mais très nourris et consciencieusement documentés, aux origines des voyages extraordinaires. Il a indiqué comment dès le début du dix-septième siècle, un souci plus grand de l'observation réaliste et détaillée se manifeste dans les récits de voyages et dans les œuvres qui en dérivent. Avec beaucoup de justesse, il a signalé l'importance des gravures dans les *Voyages* de De Bry; il a montré comment, de très bonne heure, était apparue, sous l'influence de relations authentiques, la notion d'un "troisième monde autrement appelé Terre Australe" qui devait devenir cher aux faiseurs d'utopies; il a enfin fait voir, et je me range à son opinion, comment dès le milieu du dix-septième siècle, les *Voyages fameux de Vincent Le Blanc,* édités par Pierre Bergeron en 1648, peuvent déjà être considérés comme appartenant au groupe des voyages extraordinaires. On peut cependant observer en passant qu'il était inutile de mentionner à côté l'*Ile imaginaire* de Segrais qui, par son titre et de l'aveu même de M. Atkinson, appartient à un groupe d'ouvrages entièrement différents.

Avec le chapitre sur la *Terre Australe* de Gabriel de Foigny (1676), nous sommes en plein dans le sujet. Sur l'homme lui-même, M. Atkinson ne nous apprend rien que nous ne sachions. Quant à l'ouvrage il avait été étudié par M. Lichtenberger (*Le socialisme au dix-huitième siècle,* 1895), M. G. Lanson ("Origines et premières manifestations de l'esprit philosophique" *Revue des cours et conférences, déc. 1907–déc. 1908*), et par moi-même (*L'Amérique et le rêve exotique dans la littérature française au xviie et au xviiie siècle*), sous ses différents aspects de roman utopique et socialiste, de roman philosophique et de roman exotique. M. Atkinson a voulu d'abord faire un résumé exact des aventures du héros Sadeur dans la Terre australe, aventures où le fantastique et les souvenirs mal digérés des vieilles légendes sur les pays lointains dominent. Il a montré à quels ouvrages, et en particulier à quelles relations de voyages, Foigny avait eu recours pour maints détails de couleur locale et de documentation pittoresque, ce qui à ma connaissance est nouveau. Il a analysé scrupuleusement les singulières dissertations sur la nudité, les hermaphrodites, les descriptions de vie en commun qui composent la partie centrale de l'ouvrage. Il a ainsi écrit l'étude la plus complète qui existe sur un livre dont la valeur littéraire est mince,

mais dont l'importance pour l'histoire des idées est considérable. Alors que dans les *Hermaphrodites* de Thomas Artus (1605), pour ne citer qu'un auteur entre dix, la satire de la cour occupait presque tout le champ, que dans les *Voyages de Vincent Le Blanc* au contraire l'auteur avait été attiré par la partie romanesque et aventureuse, pour la première fois, comme le montre fort bien M. Atkinson, les deux éléments se trouvent juxtaposés sinon encore fondus dans la *Terre Australe:* la satire sociale s'y trouve en effet encadrée par des chapitres de pur roman d'aventures. La formule que devait reprendre Swift dans *Gulliver* est déjà trouvée. Nous sommes d'ailleurs encore bien loin de la perfection du type. Bien que la *Terre Australe* abonde en idées bizarres et hardies, dont quelques-unes sont des inventions folles, tandis que d'autres semblent singulièrement en avance sur le temps, il est difficile de retrouver un système philosophique consistant chez Foigny. A distance nous avons tendance à exagérer l'effet produit par ces descriptions fantaisistes de sociétés imaginaires. Le bon censeur qui en 1704 donnait en ces termes son approbation à une nouvelle édition du livre: " A considérer cet ouvrage comme un pur roman, l'impression peut en être permise," exprimait probablement assez exactement le sentiment public. A ce propos, il me sera permis d'attirer l'attention sur un jugement porté par Lesage sur la *Terre Australe* et qui jusqu'ici me semble avoir échappé à l'attention des chercheurs. On pourra le voir dans *La valise trouvée,* première partie, lettre IX. Lesage qui raconte ensuite très longuement les démêlés de l'abbé Raguenet avec le libraire Barbin à propos de ce même ouvrage, déclare simplement: " Ce livre était un amas de fictions extraordinaires et prodigieuses."

Il en va autrement de l'*Histoire des Sevarambes* de Denis de Vairasse, publiée un an après (1677). Là encore, M. Atkinson a apporté des précisions qui ne manquent pas d'intérêt. Il a étudié l'édition anglaise publiée à Londres en 1675 et 1678 et montré les différences essentielles qui existent entre la version anglaise et la version française. Les pages sur la partie purement aventureuse du roman contiennent des rapprochements concluants avec plusieurs ouvrages dont Vairasse s'est évidemment inspiré. On trouvera, ici encore, chez M. Atkinson un résumé très exact et très précis des chapitres qui traitent des mœurs et des institutions des Sevarambes, de leur religion, de leur système de société

et de leur histoire. Sur un point cependant, je ne suis pas d'accord avec l'auteur. Dans mon livre sur l'*Amérique et le rêve exotique* (p. 208), j'étais arrivé à propos des lois des Sevarambes à une conclusion peu favorable, reproduite par M. Atkinson, et qu'il déclare difficile à comprendre étant donnée "the mild nature of the laws of the Sevarambes" (p. 125 n.). Si l'on s'en rapporte uniquement aux citations et au résumé de M. Atkinson il semble bien avoir raison. Après avoir de nouveau consulté le texte complet, je me sens beaucoup moins convaincu. Il est vrai que la peine de mort n'existe pas chez les Sevarambes; mais immédiatement après les lignes reproduites par M. Atkinson, Vairasse avait ajouté que dans les prisons "on est obligé de travailler beaucoup et l'on y est souvent châtié, et de temps en temps les coupables sont promenés dans les rues pour y être publiquement fouëtés autour du Palais et puis ramenés en prison jusqu'à ce que le temps ordonné pour leur châtiment soit expiré." (II, 48.) Si ce passage ne suffisait pas à justifier mon opinion je renverrais M. Atkinson à une description détaillée et assez atroce de l'application du fouet (I, p. 132). Je remarque de plus qu'en maints autres endroits Vairasse lui-même insiste sur le caractère rigoureux des lois, bien loin de parler de leur "mild nature," comme le fait M. Atkinson. La médisance et la calomnie sont sévèrement punies par les lois (II, p. 7); l'ivrognerie leur est inconnue "car outre qu'elle serait rigoureusement punie, il leur serait difficile d'avoir de quoy s'enivrer" (II, 9); trois choses empêchent la mauvaise conduite chez les jeunes filles "sçavoir la rigueur des lois, la rareté des occasions . . . ."; enfin et surtout, je rappellerai le passage suivant à savoir que chez les Sevarambes, "il n'y a que les vicieux et les perdus qui veuillent s'écarter de la règle commune et faire des actions contraires à la coutume et aux maximes approuvées de tout le monde. Parmy les Sevarambes l'exemple des vicieux incorrigibles ne va jamais guéres loin, car on les châtie très sévèrement, et quand on voit qu'ils ne s'amendent point on les envoye aux mines loin de la société des honnêtes gens" (II, p. 8). On sent combien peut être dangereuse, même chez les Sevarambes, l'application de ce dernier principe de gouvernement et à quoi peut mener cette épuration intégrale de la société.

Les idées de Vairasse et son tableau de la vie des Sevarambes sont trop complexes pour qu'il soit possible de les discuter dans

un compte rendu. M. Atkinson les a fidèlement et sobrement analysées, sans peut-être toujours les commenter assez. A côté de l'exposé des idées de Vairasse sur la religion, idées qui sentent terriblement le fagot, il aurait pu noter au moins en passant les précautions prises naïvement par l'auteur pour se protéger contre les censeurs et ses professions de foi chaleureuses en "la Religion ancienne, Orthodoxe, Catholique et Romaine, hors de laquelle il n'y a point de salut" (II, p. 226). Personne sans doute ne s'y trompait; mais le procédé est au moins amusant et sera repris on sait combien de fois au dix-huitième siècle.

C'est avec le *Télémaque* de Fénelon, d'après M. Atkinson, que le "voyage extraordinaire" atteint à la perfection. On y retrouve l'esprit des récits de voyages plutôt que des emprunts à des relations déterminées ou des souvenirs précis; mais le fait que l'intention didactique et la satire sociale y sont alliées à des aventures de voyage dans des pays mal connus des gens du dix-septième siècle, suffirait pour faire ranger le roman utopique de Fénelon dans le groupe des voyages extraordinaires. Comme on pouvait s'y attendre, c'est la partie la moins neuve et la moins originale de l'étude de M. Atkinson.

Dans ce travail très précis et très détaillé, l'auteur a donné un excellent résumé d'ouvrages encore trop peu connus et incomplètement situés. Il a tenu compte des résultats acquis par ses prédécesseurs et a fait lui-même assez de découvertes pour que son livre soit indispensable à qui veut étudier les premières manifestations de l'esprit philosophique en France à la fin du dix-huitième siècle. Je ne vois guère qu'une omission importante à signaler, celle de la thèse de M. Felix Emil Held sur *Johann Valentin Andreae's Christianopolis, an ideal state of the seventeenth century,* The Graduate school of the University of Illinois, 1914, dans laquelle on trouve (pp. 7 et 8) un certain nombre de rapprochements avec les Sevarambes. Il s'en faut d'ailleurs que tout ait été dit sur la *Terre Australe,* sur les *Sevarambes* et sur toutes ces utopies qui apparaissent au dix-septième siècle. Si nous sommes aujourd'hui passablement renseignés sur les grands courants religieux de cette période, il est bien des manifestations secondaires qui nous échappent encore. Ce ne sont pas seulement les romanciers utopistes qui dans leurs imaginations créaient l'état idéal, bien des réformateurs s'efforçaient de le réaliser. M. Atkinson, à propos

des Hermaphrodites de la *Terre Australe,* rappelle très justement un passage de Bayle sur la visionnaire Antoinette Bourignon, née en 1616 et morte en 1660. Foigny, et surtout Vairasse, érudits confus et esprits inquiets, catholiques renégats et protestants de nom, évidemment aussi peu à l'aise dans le calvinisme que dans l'orthodoxie catholique, ont dû, au cours de leurs lectures et de leurs voyages rencontrer bien d'autres hérésies et bien d'autres bizarreries politico-religieuses. On pourrait se demander si Foigny n'a pas emprunté aux Adamites quelques-unes de ses théories sur la nudité; si Vairasse n'avait pas entendu parler des Frères Moraves, peut-être des Vaudois, et plus probablement encore des Labadistes. Il est très vraisemblable qu'il a connu au moins de nom ce singulier Jean Labadie, mort trois ans avant la publication des *Sevarambes,* et qui, après avoir renoncé au catholicisme et avoir vainement essayé de s'accommoder du calvinisme de Genève, avait fondé en Hollande une secte dont les initiés vivaient en commun, mangeaient en commun et croyaient que des unions entre fidèles naissaient des enfants qui n'avaient point part au péché originel (sur Labadie, consulter James Bartlett Burleigh, The Labadist colony in Maryland, *Johns Hopkins studies in historical and political science,* XVIII, 6, 1899). On trouverait ainsi que ces utopies singulières doivent encore plus à la réalité et à la vie que nous ne pensons. Dans tel coin de la Hollande ou de l'Allemagne ont certainement existé de petites sociétés, quelquefois tolérées, souvent persécutées qui, en plus d'un point, ressemblaient à la Terre australe et au pays des Sevarambes et qui ont pu au moins fournir quelques idées aux auteurs de récits de voyages imaginaires.

Ce compte-rendu allait paraître quand un nouvel ouvrage de M. Atkinson m'est parvenu. Ce volume, écrit en anglais, bien que publié en France, contient tout d'abord un résumé assez étendu (pp. 1-26) de l'ouvrage précédent. Au point de vue de la composition, le livre est assez mal balancé: je me refuse à considérer comme des "chapitres" la note de 4 pages consacrée à *l'Histoire de Calejava* de Claude Gilbert, ou la note de 3 pages sur *Lahontan and the "good savage."* L'appendice I sur Bordelon, Bougeant et Lesconvel, aurait fort bien trouvé place dans une note de l'*Introduction;* les indications sur les "illustrations" et les gravures de De Bry (Appendice III, xiv et xv) auraient dû être mises en notes au chapitre sur le *Voyage de François Leguat.* Par contre, les

chapitres sur *Le Voyage de François Leguat* de Maximilien Misson et sur *Les voyages de Jacques Massé* de Tyssot de Patot contiennent quantités de renseignements nouveaux et intéressants dont quelques-uns sont de vraies trouvailles. M. Atkinson a le premier prouvé que le *Voyage de Leguat* accepté comme authentique dans des ouvrages aussi récents que la *Grande Encyclopédie* ou l'*Encyclopaedia Britannica* est, à n'en point douter, une compilation sans originalité d'un écrivain assez obscur, Maximilien Misson. François Leguat considéré pendant longtemps comme une autorité par les naturalistes n'a jamais existé que dans l'imagination de Misson, sur ce point aucun doute ne saurait subsister. Je ne suis pas certain que les indications sur les sources de Misson données par M. Atkinson tant dans le chapitre sur le *Voyage de Leguat* que dans l'appendice soient toutes exactes. Lui-même serait le premier à en convenir, sans doute. Les auteurs indiqués par M. Atkinson ont largement utilisé leurs prédécesseurs et sont loin d'être originaux; c'est souvent le cas de du Tertre, et encore plus souvent le cas de Rochefort. De ce que les arbres reproduits dans les gravures de Misson ont une forme sphérique, il ne s'ensuit pas qu'il a consulté les planches du *Voyage to Jamaica* où les arbres affectent la même forme. Les arbres sphériques abondent dans les vieilles gravures et sont la règle plutôt que l'exception. Mais ce sont là des détails. Il ne vaudrait guère la peine de refaire l'histoire des descriptions des chauves-souris ou du paille-en-queue (mentionné sous un bien plus vilain nom déjà, par Thévet, si je ne me trompe), l'essentiel est que nous sachions désormais qu'il s'agit là d'une supercherie littéraire et non d'un récit authentique. On s'étonne seulement après avoir lu la démonstration de M. Atkinson que les naturalistes aient pu s'y tromper si longtemps.

Les deux chapitres sur Simon Tyssot de Patot constituent l'étude la plus documentée qui ait paru jusqu'à ce jour sur ce singulier professeur de mathématiques qui, sous le masque de récits de voyages, expose les idées les plus hardies et les moins orthodoxes. Là encore, on pourrait chicaner M. Atkinson sur quelques détails. Il n'est point du tout certain que le récit de la tempête (p. 90) ait été emprunté à la *Relation* de Dellon; il vient tout droit de Rabelais et ce n'est sans doute pas le seul souvenir de son œuvre que l'on trouverait tant chez Misson que chez de Patot. D'ailleurs, les rapprochements indiqués par M. Atkinson sont en général

plus convaincants. Il me permettra cependant de lui adresser en terminant une critique qui à mon avis est la plus sérieuse que l'on puisse faire sur ses deux ouvrages. Si désormais, grâce à lui, nous sommes parfaitement renseignés sur les sources utilisées par les auteurs de voyages extraordinaires pour maint trait de mœurs ou de couleur locale, nous savons moins exactement où ces auteurs ont emprunté leurs idées sociales et philosophiques et comment ils se rattachent aux courants d'idées qui commençaient à se manifester de leur temps. Sur ce dernier point, M. Atkinson, si prodigue de rapprochements quand il s'agit d'histoire naturelle, se montre singulièrement réservé et n'ajoute que peu à ce qui était déjà connu. Il nous indique lui-même cependant, en note (p. 80), que la philosophie de Descartes, Hobbes, Gassendi et Arnaud est mentionnée par Tyssot de Patot. Ailleurs (pp. 88 et 97), il nous dit que M. Lanson avait déjà noté que Tyssot pouvait devoir quelque chose à Fontenelle et avait signalé des ressemblances avec Saint-Evremond et Spinoza. On peut se demander si ce n'est pas sur cette voie que l'auteur de ce travail, qui représente des recherches considérables et fort consciencieuses, aurait dû aiguiller son enquête. Il y a là un "bel os à moelle" qui promet la plus "substantificque" récompense à qui aura le courage de s'y attaquer. Personne n'était mieux préparé que M. Atkinson pour le faire avec succès et l'on peut regretter qu'il ne l'ait point fait.

GILBERT CHINARD.

Johns Hopkins University.

Young Boswell: Chapters on James Boswell, the Biographer, based largely on new material. By CHAUNCEY BREWSTER TINKER. Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1922.

Young Boswell makes an irresistible appeal to readers whose interest in the eighteenth century is broad rather than deep. Its easy style and clear narrative manner, together with just enough of the author's own half-suppressed humor to suggest those delightful lectures which Yale graduates look back on with delight, combine to give the book a peculiar charm.

If anyone supposes that the publication of a new series of bio-

graphical essays on Boswell is a work of supererogation in view of the number of studies already at hand, he has only to read this volume in order to discover his error. Indeed, it may be urged with reason that the very superfluity of available material on Boswell has created a special demand for a thorough and unprejudiced survey of the whole field. Few English men of letters have had a wider circle of acquaintance than Boswell, and from the countless supplementary and contradictory reports of his unique personality that have come down to us it is possible to build up a dozen different interpretations, most of which are inevitably misinterpretations. From the scathing ridicule of Macaulay to the half-hearted defense of Keith Leask, many criticisms of Boswell have seemed designed to astonish and amuse rather than to inform. Meanwhile readers of the *Life of Johnson* have constantly felt that the author of that great work, however conceited and eccentric, could not possibly have been so petty or so boorish as he has been painted. And now comes *Young Boswell,* entertaining without being tawdry, convincing without being controversial.

Particularly illuminating is the study of Boswell's social genius, and of his biographical methods as revealed in his letters, journals, and proof-sheets. The new material is, indeed, invaluable, not in giving new incidents in his life but in clarifying our conception of his aims and ideals as a biographer.

There is not, however, as much new material in one particular as one might infer from a hasty glance at the Preface. Boswell's letters to Temple are well known, and though Professor Tinker informs us that the MS. "has not been studied since 1857," the *editio princeps* of that year, supplemented by Thomas Seccombe's edition (1908), leaves but little to be desired. A careful collation of the sixteen letters quoted, with the same letters as printed in 1908, has enabled me to find only one (p. 28—incorrectly indexed as p. 18) where a new reading of the MS. has been of any material importance.

By an odd coincidence the chapters on "Boswell in Love" and "Wooing a Wife," which aroused such enthusiasm when printed in the *Atlantic Monthly,* will be the least satisfactory to careful students of the eighteenth century. It is unfortunate, but perhaps inevitable in view of the lack of evidence, that "the Moffat

woman" and Miss "W——t" should both remain unidentified. There would seem, however, to be no special reason for dismissing Boswell's wife, in a long chapter entitled "Wooing a Wife," with less than three pages, and with no hint of the humiliating terms on which she married. As a matter of fact, the terms which Margaret Montgomery accepted as a condition of her marriage furnished Boswell with a club to hold over her during all the rest of her life. How often he used it is a matter of conjecture. When he had the insolence to publish, in 1781, the conditions of their one-sided matrimonial bargain, he paid his wife the awkward compliment of saying that he had never had to use it—*yet*. But the threat remained:

"Naturally somewhat singular, independent of any additions which affectations and vanity may perhaps have made, I resolved to have a more pleasing species of marriage than common, and bargained with my bride that I should not be bound to live with her longer than I really inclined; and that whenever I tired of her domestic society I should be at liberty to give it up. Eleven years have elapsed, and I have never yet wished to take advantage of my stipulated privilege."[1]

If Professor Tinker was looking for pathos, here is material far more pathetic than the unconvincing *argument from silence* on which (pp. 163-4) he leans so heavily.

A much more startling lack in these chapters concerns the long narrative of Boswell's Dutch flirtation. The heroine of this international romance, Mlle. de Zuylen, is not adequately identified, and her own version of why she broke with Boswell—the point of the whole story—is omitted. It seems impossible that Professor Tinker could be unaware of the facts, but equally impossible that, being aware of them, he would cut the heart out of his story by suppressing them. Who was this Mlle. de Zuylen, intimately known as Zélide? She was to become the famous Mme. de Charrière; her pen name, when she used one, was *Abbé de la Tour;* she was a satirist and novelist of no mean importance, several of her works being translated into English and German; after her marriage she became the confidante of Benjamin Constant, who finally abandoned her for Mme. de Staël; she has been honored

[1] Quoted in Hill's edition of Boswell, VI, p. 26, n., from Boswell's *Hypochondriacks* in the *London Magazine*, 1781, p. 156.

by two long essays from the pen of Sainte-Beuve;[2] she is the subject of a profusely illustrated two-volume biography by Philippe Godet, *Mme. de Charrière et ses amis,* from which the full story of her affair with Boswell has been excellently retold in English by Augustin Birrell in the *Fortnightly Review* for September, 1906, and again by Francis Gribble in the *Nineteenth Century* for November, 1912. Although Boswell's letters to Temple are drawn on at great length by Professor Tinker for the man's side of the story, they leave at the very climax a gap which can be supplied from the correspondence of Zélide herself.

For a long time these two had been attracted and repelled by each other. The marriage of a notorious libertine like Boswell, who, nevertheless, insisted on absolute decorum from his wife, to a woman as defiantly unconventional as Zélide, held forth a promise of keen excitement to the world at large and to the two principals themselves. By piecing together the available letters we find that they were on the point of accepting each other when Zélide discovered in her admirer a degree of literary vanity that she could not tolerate. She was preparing not only to translate Boswell's *Corsica* into French but to abridge it. To Boswell this was little short of sacrilege, and his attitude on the matter gave Zélide a new insight into his character which led her to break with him. The absolute frankness of her correspondence with Constant d'Hermenches leaves us little ground to suspect the truth of the following statement written to him on June 2nd, 1768:

"L'auteur [Boswell] quoiqu'il fût dans ce moment presque décidé à m'épouser, si je le voulais, n'a pas voulu sacrifier à mon goût une syllabe de son livre. Je lui ai écrit que j'étais très décidée à ne jamais l'épouser, et j'ai abandonné la traduction."[3]

If literary collaboration was impossible, Zélide knew only too well that the infinitely more complex collaboration of domestic life would be far more so. He would not sacrifice "a syllable,"—and she would not, for such a man, sacrifice her independence. And what an escape for them both! Boswell rebounded (after several awkward caroms) into the arms of long-suffering Margaret Mont-

[2] In *Portraits des femmes* and *Portraits litteraires.*

[3] Philippe Godet, *Madame de Charrière et ses amis* (Genève, 1906), I, pp. 138-9.

gomery; while Zélide, soon tired of her humdrum life as Mme. de Charrière the schoolmaster's wife, found what consolation she could in a brilliant literary career and in the intimate friendship of Benjamin Constant.

Although the omission of such important material from the chapters on "Boswell in Love" and "Wooing a Wife" might well shake one's confidence in all the rest of the book, such omissions are the exception rather than the rule. In general, the old material is carefully handled, with a generous admixture of letters now first printed. Hence it is that the book as a whole serves to convey a clearer and fairer picture of Boswell than we have had before. He is not the Boswell of the older biographies, an insolent idiot, but a boisterous, eccentric genius always willing to put himself in a bad light in order to illustrate the dazzling radiance of Dr. Johnson.

EDWARD D. SNYDER.

Haverford, Pa.

Short Stories of America. By ROBERT L. RAMSAY, Ph. D. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1921. 348 pp.

It may be conceded, I believe, that further analysis of the short story art is not urgently needed. The secrets of the writer's technique have been adequately disclosed in dozens of manuals and text-books. But for discriminating collections of short stories, particularly those made from a fresh point of view, there is always room. Such a book is the collection of regional short stories which Professor Ramsay has brought together.

The book is not, as the title might seem to indicate, a gathering of patriotic or historical tales. It is only geographically that these stories may be called American, for their authors seize eagerly upon alien ways and half-foreign speech or upon archaic survivals that seem scarcely less foreign. And they can hardly be said to portray the diverse scenery of America more faithfully than do many ordinary stories of adventure. A text-book need not, of course, be named with technical precision; and it must be admitted that for the literary type with which Professor Ramsay deals no wholly satisfactory name has been devised. Of the three which he mentions—American regionalism, local color, and the spirit of home—the last seems to me wholly inadmissible. Home as such

plays no real part in these stories, and its spirit, whatever it may be, has not been confined to any form of literature. The term local color, besides belonging to another art, is perhaps somewhat narrower than the thing to be named, for Professor Ramsay has found in the contrast between regionalism, "the literature of the restricted locality," and Americanism, "the literature of the undifferentiated nation as a whole," something akin to the strife between states' rights and national unity.

This contrast is made concrete by a literary map in which the regions already exploited by the local colorists appear as the twenty-five literary states of America. These states are grouped into five sections: New England, The East, The South, The Middle West, and The West. In the South, for example, Professor Ramsay finds eight literary states: *The Old Dominion, Appalachia,* the mountain section, *The Blue Grass, The Middle South, The Lower South, The Swamp Region, The Creole Country, The River Country,* and *Canebrakes and Ozarks.*

No attempt has been made to represent each of these states by a story. The selections are grouped, according to stages in the development of the local color short story, into four classes: American types, American traditions, American landscapes, and American communities, in the last of which are blended evenly the elements of picturesque type, social heritage, and local scene. With the exception of *The Luck of Roaring Camp,* which is demanded by chronology, and *A Municipal Report,* which it would be hard to omit, though it probably belongs as much to some other parts of the South as to the Blue Grass, Professor Ramsay has been able to choose stories that have not yet found their way into the anthologies. This book is consequently as interesting to the general reader as to the student of American fiction. It is supplied with study questions and reading lists, designed to make the regional short story, not only "the interpreter of America," but also a means of escape, for students and teachers, from the tedium of the "weekly theme."

Professor Ramsay is an inveterate and acute maker of classifications. His book impresses one as an example of good workmanship throughout; and in thus setting before us in orderly array the riches of our regional fiction he has performed an extremely useful service.

JOHN C. FRENCH.

The Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE

On *King Lear*

In your June issue (pp. 346-347), Mr. W. F. Tamblyn shows that Burgundy of *King Lear* is an insertion by Shakespeare in the old story and argues that by Burgundy Shakespeare meant the king of Spain. This interpretation fits well into the historical events of the time, for France and Spain were the candidates for the hand of Princess Elizabeth as France and Burgundy are for that of Cordelia. Immediately after the accession of King James, Rosny, the French ambassador, proposed a marriage between Elizabeth and the Dauphin of France, a proposal that was supposed at the time to have met with high favor from King James.[1] On the other hand, James was trying to dicker off Prince Henry and Princess Elizabeth to the King of Spain and the catholic interests, among other things, for the acknowledged headship of the English church.[2] It is to be remembered in this connection that in part of these negotiations Shakespeare himself played the part of an idle uniform.[3] Also, part of the Gunpowder Plot in 1605 was to marry Princess Elizabeth to some Catholic gentleman and thus retain control of the government.[4] Thus the marriage of Princess Elizabeth was a live issue 1603-6, within which period *Lear* was written, and the contestants were France and Spain, parti-protestant and catholic.

It seems then that Mr. Tamblyn has here unearthed a pretty little hint from William Shakespeare to King James, officially delivered Dec. 26, 1606. The hint is doubly interesting as indicating Shakespeare's own reaction on this important question. We are not justified, it is true, in supposing that Shakespeare was now all love for France, since the favorable conception of France in *Lear* is to be found also in the source, and the conception needed heightening for proper contrast; it may be merely not that Shakespeare disliked France less but that he disliked Spain more. Still I think one feels a little less of insular prejudice here against the French than in many of the earlier plays. Probably then, thanks to a broader experience and to some years of residence with the Frenchman Mountjoy, the wig maker of Silver Street, Shakespeare was now more appreciative of France. At any rate, we have here some indication that Shakespeare leaned to France rather than to Spain, with all that such leaning implies.

T. W. Baldwin.

Reed College.

---

[1] Gardiner, *History of England* 1603-1642, I, 107; Aikin, *Memoirs of the Court of King James I*, I, 134.

[2] Gardiner, *History*, I and II; Aikin, *Memoirs*, I.

[3] Law, *Shakespeare as a Groom of the Chamber.*

[4] Gayley, *Beaumont the Dramatist*, 52.

Poems "Signed" by Sir Thomas Wyatt

The edition of Surrey's poems by Prof. Padelford includes, as no. 20 of its texts, five stanzas beginning "I that Vlysses yeres haue spent." Though assigned to Surrey by the only manuscript, Harley 78, this poem is by Tottel (ed. Arber p. 241) included among the poems by Uncertain Authors, and Prof. Padelford considers its authenticity "very doubtful."

Upon the question of authenticity or authorship some light may be cast by observing that the initial letters of the five stanzas are I-A-W-T-T, which, by a transposition not difficult to the Tudor mind, give Wyatt's name.

Another poem, not in any manuscript known to us, and printed by Tottel (Arber p. 14) among the poems of Surrey, is reprinted thence by Prof. Padelford as his no. 13. It opens "When ragyng loue with extreme payne," and the initial letters of its five stanzas read, in sequence, W-I-A-T-T.

Both these poems are in six-line stanzas, and of five stanzas only; another poem of the same structure and length, printed by Tottel (Arber p. 184) among verse by Uncertain Authors, is initialled T-A-W-I-T.

To these it may be added that one of the accredited Wyatt-poems, printed from Ms. Adds. 17492 by Miss Foxwell on p. 315 of her first volume, has to its three seven-line stanzas this sequence of line-initials:—T-T-T-T-T-W-A; T-T-T-T-T-T-Y; W-W-W-W-W-T-T. Not only the mass of W's and T's here, but the T. WYATT given by the initials of 6 and 7, 13 and 14, 20 and 21, proclaim the authorship of the poem, which is not in the autograph Egerton Ms. nor in Tottel. Wyatt's procedure here makes it evident that he was no stranger to the literary trick he uses. He uses it, indeed, for other than his own name; the poem printed by Miss Foxwell 1: 257, and beginning "Suffryng in sorow in hope to attayn," shows in its stanza-initials the word SHELTUN. As the unique copy is found in Ms. Adds. 17492, once the property of Surrey's sister and of her friend Mary Shelton, and as the name of Mary Shelton is written at the foot of the page bearing the poem, such evidence of Wyatt's literary "gallantry" has its interest.

The editor of Wyatt-texts, noting the first three poems above mentioned, and looking through the Wyatt-corpus for any further traces of such signatures, is puzzled by the verse printed pp. 286, 323, and 357 of Miss Foxwell's edition. In the poem at p. 286 the five stanzas give the initials I-A-W-T-Y; in the second poem we find A-W-W-T-I. These are both from the manuscript Adds. 17492. The third text, from the *Courte of Venus,* shows T-W-W-I-T-A. Regarding the first of the three we may observe that the Y represents in Miss Foxwell's print the word *Ytt.* Should we read "That," instead, we might by no very great strain

take the anagram to be WIATT or T. WIAT. In the case of the other two poems we may query whether the second W be intentional on the writer's part, or whether the frequency of line-openings with *When,* with *And,* with *The, Thou,* or *That,* and (in lyric) with the pronoun *I,* is responsible for some of these apparent signatures.

Such a query is emphasized by reading Wyatt's epigram *To Anna* (Foxwell p. 48), in which the first four of the seven lines are initialled W-T-I-A; and by noting the first four tercets of the satire to Brian (ibid. p. 147) with their sequence A-T-W-I; also by the first four lines of the treizaine on p. 171, beginning Y-T-W-A. The second of these cases is worth very little, the poem being in terza rima; nor is there any import in the inset-initialling W-W-I-T-A etc. on p. 256 of Tottel, since that poem is in couplets. And in such a poem as the quatrains printed Tottel p. 191, the fact that the first five lines begin A-T-W-A-I is another argument for the possibility of coincidence. One hardly knows, indeed, where to draw the line between such anagrams as the long-obvious *Damascene Awdley* and *Edward Somerset* (Tottel 105, 164) and the *An Adams* of Wyatt's (doubtful) poem printed on p. 268 of Miss Foxwell's edition. Where is the frontier between coincidence and deliberate purpose?

But as for the Shelton poem and that beginning "The ioye so short alas the paine so nere," there can be no doubt of the poet's intention. In the latter the student of poetry as well as the mechanician shows his hand; the line moves with the same flow that is heard at the beginning of an anonymous poem of the Ms. Fairfax 16,—"The tyme so long the payn ay mor and more,"—and, earlier than these, in the opening line of Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules.* Compare, too, Sackville's *Induction,* line 288.

ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND.

Boston.

BRIEF MENTION.

The Problem of Style, by J. Middleton Murry (Oxford University Press, 1922. vii, 148 pp.). Here are six excellent lectures, which "were delivered in the school of English Literature at Oxford . . . . in the Summer Term of 1921." The titles are: (1) the Meaning of Style; (2) the Psychology of Style; (3) Poetry and Prose; (4) the Central Problem of Style; (5) the Process of Creative Style; (6) the English Bible; and the Grand Style. An analytic table of contents serves the useful purpose of

showing the argument in outline,—an outline of the details employed to elucidate the primary aspects of the subject assumed in the six titles.

As here discussed the problem of style concerns the literary artist, not the pupils in the composition-classes of the schools and colleges. The instructor of composition has few occasions to report a pupil that has acquired a true and practical conception of style. This is not as it should be, nor is the remedy far to seek. Surely the college-student should be brought to understand and to feel deeply the truth that 'writing' is self-expression. To teach and to be taught the meaning of 'self-expression' should prove a mutual delight, for that meaning is both profoundly and attractively philosophic. The teacher should persist in the inculcation of the truth that the art of expression in language from its elementary forms all the way thru to its highest forms is made valid by the observance of the same underlying principles of taste and intellectual rectitude. The creed of the class in composition is also the creed of the 'writer' who by his art has won membership in the Academy. Buffon's famous address,—well, is not every precept and observation applicable to the beginner? Not to recall the truest of all brief definitions of style, *le style est l'homme même*, let a few of his sentences be cited: "Style is simply the order and movement one gives to one's thoughts." . . . "The human spirit can *create* nothing, nor can it bring forth at all until fertilized by experience and meditation; in its acquired knowledge lie the germs of its productions." A proper preparation, by study, reflection, and planning brings the mind into a state of eagerness for writing. The writer (seldom a member of a composition-class) "has now only pleasure in writing: his ideas follow one another easily, and the style is natural and smooth. A certain warmth born of that pleasure diffuses itself throughout, giving life to every phrase." [The citations from Buffon are according to Dr. Lane Cooper's *Theories of Style*, The Macmillan Co., 1907.]

Mr. Murry's lectures are admirably planned and composed to conduct the reader in an instructive and entertaining manner thru a survey of the characteristics of style in creative literature. He does not, one must regret, trace the highest forms of style from their true beginning in the early stages of one's training in speech and writing, from that period of experience in which the elementary teacher is expected to establish initial habits in the proper use of the vernacular art. Fundamental to a discussion of style, highly developed and conventionalized, would be a chapter on the growth of the mind in the perception of the truth that expression in language in all its degrees is the practice of an art in its various degrees and conventionalized forms. That the primary principle of self-expression in the true sense of style can be inculcated in early years is demonstrated by what in those years is acquired

respecting individuality in dress while conforming to approved standards. The analogy has more value than would be inferred from Mr. Murry's references to it: "Style is organic—not the clothes a man wears, but the flesh, bone, and blood of his body" (p. 136); "to judge style primarily by an analysis of language is almost on a level with judging a man by his clothes" (p. 134). Mr. Murry tends to indulge in emphatic exclusions of this sort and thereby sacrifices the inherent comprehensiveness of his subject, altho gaining in precision of definition for a less organic and more restricted aspect of creative style. For example, he contends that the issue is confused by allowing "good taste in language . . . to masquerade as a creative principle. Good taste in language will not carry a writer anywhere." The argument follows: Massinger had taste in language but "his style was generally bad," because "his way of feeling and thinking was not his own; his perceptions were blunted and clumsy." Conversely, Webster had "positive style," but "not at all a good taste in language,"—. . . "but his way of thinking and feeling was individual" (p. 137).

Mr. Murry handles his subject in a gracefully free manner. He is not restrained by the plan of a formal treatise, altho he offers material that would gain another value if put into that framework. The free manner provides an escape from responsibilities of the rigid sort. It does not so seriously warn against "the danger of talking about the accidents and not about the essentials," or "the danger of vague generalization." It prepares a broad canvas: "Style is many things"; but the law of perspective demands a fixed point of view, a centralizing tenet: "Style is many things; but the more definable these are, the more capable of being pointed at with the finger, the more remote are they from the central meaning hidden in the word: the expression that is inevitable and organic to an individual mode of experience" (p. 35). The dominant teaching of these lectures is thus briefly expressed; it is the recognition of a central meaning to a wide complexity of meanings. The central meaning adopted is developed from Stendhal's "best of all definitions of style," which is translated thus: "Style is this: to add to a given thought all the circumstances fitted to produce the whole effect that the thought ought to produce" (p. 79). This should be added: "I do not think, therefore, that there is any improper simplification in regarding the work of literature as the communication of individual thought and feeling, or in taking Stendhal's definition, interpreted largely, as one which holds good of style of every kind, in so far as it is excellent in its kind" (p. 125). In other terms, says Mr. Murry, "Style is a quality of language which communicates precisely emotions or thoughts, or a system of emotions or thoughts peculiar to the author," and inasmuch as it has been argued that prose is essentially of the same creative nature as poetry, the definition is further articulated: "Where thought predominates, there the

expression will be in prose; where emotion predominates, the expression will be indifferently in prose or poetry, except that in case of overwhelming immediate personal emotion the tendency is to find expression in poetry. Style is perfect when the communication of the thought or emotion is exactly accomplished; its position in the scale of greatness, however, will depend upon the comprehensiveness of the system of emotions and thoughts to which the reference is perceptible" (p. 71).

Style must therefore precisely communicate individual mode of experience, individual thought and feeling or emotions. The intellectual side of style, the element of knowledge or science and the enriching colors of allusion would thus seem to be adequately symbolized in the word 'thought' (defined as a general term, p. 79). But Mr. Murry does not with Coleridge consider the outfit in knowledge required to write an epic; he is not mindful of what Keats lamented in his preparation to write his best; he does not with Wordsworth find it to his purpose to observe the hand-in-hand march of science and poetry; but he does offer the challenging dictum: "In literature there is no such thing as pure thought; in literature, thought is always the handmaid of emotion" (p. 73). And "The thought that plays a part in literature is systematized emotion, emotion become habitual till it attains the dignity of conviction. . . . In one way or another the whole of literature consists in this communication of emotion" (p. 74). But is not the profounder truth disclosed by substituting emotionalized knowledge for 'systematized emotion'? The poet, it would seem, must know the things as they are before he can represent them as they should be.

The true relation of emotion to exact knowledge is not discussed by Mr. Murry, and this omission impels one to revert to the need of elementary school-instruction that may be soundly philosophic and therefore true to the principles of the vernacular art. The 'love of knowledge,' which the schools should strive to awaken and strengthen has the emotional implications of the 'mode of experience' assumed by Mr. Murry to lie at the foundation of 'true style,' of pleasurable and honest self-expression. A complete philosophy of style is therefore not attempted in these lectures, but there is a good fund of discerning criticism and a persuasive adroitness in elucidating various aspects of the central problem of style in the highest forms of creative literature.

Special attention is called to the adoption of the word 'crystallization' (note p. 146) in the last three lectures to describe what "is central to the effort after precision" (p. 88, cf. p. 95). "In metaphor we have this process of crystallization in its most elaborate form" (p. 98). This 'process' is "harped upon" and "emphasized" with the conviction that to save it from neglect or misuse is to rebuke the heresy of the imagist (p. 110). But Mr.

Murry would have deserved thanks by a summarizing definition of his new term. The term must be used to signify that the creative style has its culminations in symbols that carry the meaning of the 'thought' or the emotion to a true apex. One may venture to say that Mr. Murry's style attains crystallization when, warning the writer against a condition of society produced by "modern sentimentality" and "empty emotionalism," he exclaims "it is as though he [the writer] found himself playing on a piano whose every key sounded the same note" (p. 131). The figure surely yields a fine emphasis: "In the exasperated endeavour to get some differentiation of response out of it he is tempted to exaggerate, to pound with a hammer upon those senseless keys."

The argument is often pointed by a bit of concrete criticism: "When the musical suggestion is allowed to predominate, decadence of style has begun. I think you will find a great many examples of this sacrifice of the true creativeness of language in Swinburne, and not a few in . . . Mr. Conrad" (p. 86). Doughty's *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, "a masterpiece of prose," is "an example of a perfect idiosyncracy of style" (p. 17); whereas an artificiality becomes "unhealthy" in the later work both of Meredith and Henry James" (p. 18); these authors, it is believed, "suffered from . . . atrophy of the central originating powers" (p. 21). An excessive delight in the formal graces and intricacies of style may "take the place of the primary emotion upon which a real vitality of style depends," and that "was not seldom the fate of Henry James," who attained "an hypertrophy of style. It has a sort of vitality; but it is the vitality of a weed or a mushroom, a vitality that we cannot call precisely spurious, but that we certainly cannot call real" (p. 22). There is a challenge in some of Mr. Murry's critical *obiter dicta*. Thus Wordsworth's *Resolution and Independence* "might have been a great poem; *instead it is a great ruin*" (p. 106). Some "great works of literature are awkward and uncomfortable in their form," that is what one feels to be true of *Hamlet*, Wordsworth's *Prelude*, *The Ring and the Book*, and *The Dynasts* (p. 54). Mr. Murry feels "that the superstitious reverence for the style of the Authorized Version really stands in the way of a frank approach to the problem of style" He believes it "scarcely an exaggeration to say that the style of one half of the English Bible is atrocious" (p. 135).

That the same fundamental principles govern all grades of style, of personal expression, from the elementary school or from the limited individuality to the highest art of the genius, this truth is stressed at the end of these lectures, but still not in the way of recognizing the pedagogic side of the subject called for in this notice. But these closing words have the widest application: "the smallest writer can do something to ensure that his individu-

ality is not lost, by trying to make sure that he feels what he thinks he feels;—that he thinks what he thinks he thinks, that his words mean what he thinks they mean." J. W. B.

Contemporary French Texts. General Editor, E. B. Babcock. Vol. I. Paul Hervieu: *La Course du flambeau.* Edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by G. N. Henning (Boston, D. C. Heath & Co., 1922. xxi, 151 pp.). The new series of *Contemporary French Texts* will present modern masterpieces, written within the last generation. In his "Avis au lecteur," prefacing this series, Professor Babcock stresses the importance of knowing contemporary works of fiction, poetry, and especially drama. For the initial volume it was no mistake to choose Hervieu as author and Professor Henning as editor. The former was the foremost psychological dramatist of pre-war days; the latter is well-known for his careful editorial workmanship (on Dumas' *Question d'argent,* on *French Lyrics of the Nineteenth Century,* etc.). The present volume is equipped with complete apparatus: Introduction, Bibliography, Notes and Vocabulary. The Introduction, though brief, is thorough-going in its handling of Hervieu's life and character, his realism, his career as novelist and playwright. If there is a fault, it may be that extreme condensation and the desire to make a number of good points have tended rather to blur the total picture. But the important thing is that Professor Henning has written a really *literary* Introduction and the same merit attaches to a number of his Notes—that is, they not only explain matters of a linguistic or socio-historical significance, but they discuss the characters and plot, the quality of style and the philosophy of life contained in *La Course du flambeau.* This procedure is highly to be recommended to other editors of French texts. Few of these at present satisfy what is the chief interest of the intelligent advanced student—namely, to learn something about the author's material in the way of ideas and his treatment in the way of technique. Are such matters to be left forever to the initiative and resources of the individual instructor? Now that so many mature people are improving their knowledge of French, literary interpretation should no longer be largely suppressed for the greater glory of the *passé indéfini* or in order to record once more when the battle of Waterloo was fought. Professor Henning does not neglect such information, but he also —to give specific instances—discusses the motivation in Sabine's rejection of Stangy, notes the advancing complexity in Hervieu's style, and compares his attitude regarding divorce with that of other playwrights. One could have wished that he had done even more to link Hervieu with Dumas *fils* and to demonstrate how *La Course du flambeau* is a "well-made play." For example, the

alignment, in Act I, of the two incidental mothers—one who is spoiled and one who does the spoiling—is a device of which Dumas *fils* would have approved. Few omisisons, of the annoying kind that confess editorial ignorance, are to be found either in Notes or Vocabulary. Perhaps a little more explanation of French bankruptcy and its terms would have been appropriate. A good short Bibliography adds to the value of this thoroughly commendable text. E. P. D.

Wortgeographie der hochdeutschen Umgangssprache von Paul Kretschmer (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1918. xvi + 638 pp.). This is not a new dialect dictionary, but a cross-section, as it were, of all the German dialect dictionaries. This does not mean that all the material there contained is here reproduced: this would require a work larger than Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. It is rather an epitome of the most interesting dialect material found in the conventional dictionaries, supplemented by data obtained by the author from his informants at various places in German-speaking territory. It is largely a dictionary of concepts and ideas, whereas mere dialect words, for which there is no equivalent in other parts of the country, have been excluded. Furthermore, names of animals and plants have only been included where special interest attached to the forms in question: ten pages, for example, are devoted to a discussion of *Kartoffel, Erdapfel, Grundbirne,* and their dialectic derivatives. *Flieder, Holder,* and *Holunder,* which do not everywhere designate the same plant, are also treated with discrimination and interest. Most striking, however, is the wealth of material collected under the heading *schlittern,* 'auf einer mit Eis bedeckten glatten Stelle mit den Stiefeln dahingleiten,' *i. e.* 'to slide on the ice.' This children's term has escaped the levelling influence of the literary language, and the author has thus been able to record and to discuss more than fifty designations for this universal sport:

schlittern, glitschen, schorren, schleistern, hackern, glisseken, schüttern, schlindern, reiten, reiteln, schlieen, Bahn schlagen, schlickern, schusseln, zescheln, zischen, ruscheln, schindern, schinguliren, kascheln, köschen, rutschen, klennern, glennen, schleifen, schliffern, schlifetzen, schlussern, schlimmern, hätscheln, hötschen, heizeln, hälzeln, rantscheln, rieseln, russeln, tschussen, kladerietschen, tschirrn, schiffeln, tschillern, tschmidern, schuppern, schuffeln, schuben, schabeiten, scharweiden, rinnen, schlibberen, schleichen, schlichtern, tschibeln, zwiefeln, schlieren, rollen.

These instances will suffice to show that even the well-equipped scholar will find in this indispensable book a wealth, not only of information, but also of stimulation. W. K.

INDEX

PAGE

Adjectives in Lope de Vega... 398
Adjuration, Asseveration and — 292
aigre, O. F..... 438
Alliterative Poem..... 355
America, Short Stories of..... 502
American College Play..... 157
—— Novel..... 115
Analysis, Semantic..... 251
Armstrong, E. C.: Lanson's Manuel bibliographique de la littérature française..... 64
Arnold, Matthew..... 183
Art, Sepulchre of Christ in—, 367
As You Like It..... 65
Asseveration and Adjuration.. 292
Atkinson, G., The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature before 1700; The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature from 1700 to 1720, 491
Austin, H. D., Dante Notes... 36

Babbitt, I., Schiller and Romanticism 257
——, Reply to Professor —... 268
Bach, M. G., Wieland's Attitude toward Woman and her Cultural and Social Relations, 482
Background of Browning's *Love Among the Ruins*..... 312
Baldwin, T. W., *On King Lear*, 504
Banville, Théodore de..... 328
Barnavelt 470
Baudin, M., The Rôle of the Ghost in *Hamlet*..... 185
Baum, P. F., The Mare and the Wolf 350
Bayle, Pierre, and his Biographers 55
Beauchamps' *Recherches sur les Théâtres de France*..... 466
Beck, Margaret M., The Dance of Death in Shakespeare... 372
Bell, C. H., The Call of the Blood in Mediæval German Epic 17
Belshazzar 355

PAGE

Benedetto, L. F., Le origini di *Salammbô* 175
Beowulf 418
Bierstadt, A. M., Unacknowledged Poems by Thomas Campbell 343
Bonnard, Sylvestre, and the Fairy 248
——, and Philetas..... 56
Book of German Lyrics..... 431
Boswell, James..... 498
Bridges, R., Milton's Prosody. 316
Brief Rejoinder..... 181
Bright, J. W.: R. Bridges, Milton's Prosody..... 316
——: O. Jespersen, Language: its Nature, Development, and Origin 379
——: F. P. Le Buffe, *The Hound of Heaven:* An Interpretation 124
——: J. M. Murry, The Problem of Style..... 506
——: T. S. Omond, A Study of Metre 59
——: Philological Quarterly.. 254
——: G. Sampson, English for the English..... 445
——: E. Sapir, Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech 188
——: G. Stern, 'Swift,' 'Swiftly,' and their Synonyms.... 251
Brooke, T., Stanza-Connection in the *Fairy Queen*..... 223
Brooks, N. C., The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy with Special Reference to the Liturgic Drama..... 367
Broughton, L. N.: O. Elton, A Survey of English Literature, 1780-1880 110
Browning's *Love Among the Ruins* 312
——'s *The Ring and the Book*. 183
Bruns, F., A Book of German Lyrics 431

PAGE

Burlingame, E. W., Etymology of *Burlingame* (*Burlingham*), 123
——, St. Cuthbert and the King's Daughter 187
Burns and England..... 76

Call of the Blood..... 17
Callaway, M., Jr., The Dative of Time How Long in Old English 129
Campbell, T., Poems..... 343
Campbell, T. M.: E. Ermatinger, Das dichterische Kunstwerk, 362
Captives, Heywood's..... 63
Carnival Comedy..... 40
Catalogue of the Library of the late J. H. Wrenn..... 237
Causality in *Samson Agonistes*, 333
Chambers, R. W., *Beowulf*, an Introduction to the Study of the Poem with a Discussion of the Stories of Offa and Finn 418
Chantilly, manuscrit 617 de —, 106
Château d'Amour..... 49
Chateaubriand et l'Abbé C. F. Painchaud 101
—— et Mrs. Sutton..... 193
Chaucer's *Prologue*, 1-7..... 86
——'s *Wife of Bath's Tale*... 339
Chevy Chase..... 436
Chew, S. C.: A. C. Judson, Thomas Heywood, *The Captives; or the Lost Recovered*..... 63
——: T. R. Smith, Anthology of Swinburne's *Poems*..... 128
Chinard, G. Chateaubriand et l'Abbé C. F. Painchaud..... 101
——, Chateaubriand et Mrs. Sutton: l'epilogue d'un roman d'amour 193
——: G. Atkinson, The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature before 1700; The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature from 1700 to 1720..... 491
——: W. P. Ker, Fleurs de France, Poésies lyriques depuis le Romantisme..... 320
Christ, Sepulchre of..... 367
Church-and-Stage Controversy in Granada..... 284
Church, H. W., Kuhns, O., and —, E. Rostand, *Cyrano de Bergerac* 47

PAGE

Cid, Corneille's..... 296
Cid Theme in France..... 296
Cleanness 355
Clark, A. M., Thomas Heywood as a Critic..... 217
Classicism, French..... 244
Coad, O. S., An Old American College Play..... 157
Cohen, G., Écrivains français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVIIe siècle..... 434
——, Mystères et Moralités du manuscrit 617 de Chantilly, 106
Coleman, A.: L. F. Benedetto, Le origini di *Salammbô*..... 175
College Play..... 157
Collins Canon..... 181
Collitz, H., Germanische Wortdeutungen 215, 274
Colton, M. A.: T. Navarro Tomás, Manual de Pronunciación Española..... 227
Comedia del Infamador..... 206
Comedy, German Carnival —.. 40
Comment on Milton's *History of Britain*..... 474
Composition, French..... 370
Comus, Milton's..... 118
Confrey, B., A Note on Richard Crashaw..... 250
Cons, L., La Préface des Fables de La Fontaine..... 246
Constans, A., Georges de Scudéry's Lost Epic..... 212
Conversation, French..... 370
Coriolanus 449
Corneille's *Cid*..... 296
——'s Relations with Louis Petit 307
Coryate, Tom..... 53
Course, la, du flambeau..... 511
Covarruvias 320
Crane, R. S., An Early Eighteenth-Century Enthusiast for Primitive Poetry: John Husbands 27
Crashaw, Richard..... 250
Crawford, A. W., A Note on *Julius Caesar* 164
——, Keats's *Ode to the Nightingale* 476
Critic, Thomas Heywood as a —, 217
Cultural Relations of Woman, 482
Cummings, H., Chaucer's *Prologue*, 1-7..... 86
Cueva's *Comedia del Infamador* and the Don Juan Legend.. 206

PAGE

Cyrano de Bergerac 47
Dama boba 167
Dance of Death in Shakespeare, 372
Dante Notes 36
Dargan, E. P.: G. N. Henning, Hervieu, *La Course du flambeau* 511
Dative of Time How Long in Old English 129
Deluge 355
dichterische Kunstwerk, Das .. 362
Did Wordsworth jest with Matthew? 279
Don Juan Legend 206
Drama, Folk-Lore Themes in —, 339
Dramatic Art of Lope de Vega, 167
—— Associations of the Easter Sepulchre 62
Draper, J. W.: T. J. Wise, A Catalogue of the Library of the late J. H. Wrenn 237
Early Eighteenth Century Enthusiast for Primitive Poetry: John Husbands 27
Easter Sepulchre 62
Écrivains français en Hollande, 434
Eddy, W. A., A Source for Gulliver's First Voyage 353
——, Rabelais,—A Source for *Gulliver's Travels* 416
Eighteenth-Century Emendations to *Chevy Chase* 436
Elton, O., A Survey of English Literature. 1780-1880 110
Elyot's, Sir Thomas, *Titus and Gysippus* 1
Emendations to *Chevy Chase* .. 436
Emerson, O. F., Milton's *Comus*, 93-94 118
England, Burns and —..... 76
—— and the Englishman in German Literature of the 18th Century 448
English for the English 445
—— Literature 110
—— Poets 443
Enthusiast for Primitive Poetry, 27
Epic, Lost —..... 212
——, Mediæval German 17
Ermatinger, E., Das dichterische Kunstwerk 362
Erroneous Ascription to Wyatt, 188
Errors in Beauchamps' *Recherches* 466
Etymology of *Burlingame* (*Burlingham*) 123

PAGE

Evening Star in Milton 444
Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature 491

Fables de La Fontaine 246
Fairy, Sylvestre Bonnard and the —..... 248
Fairy Queen 223
Farnham, W., Scogan's *Quem Quaeritis* 289
Favart's *La Fée Urgele* 339
Fay, P. B.: O. Towles, Prepositional Phrases of Asseveration and Adjuration in Old and Middle French 292
Fée Urgele 339
Feminine Nouns and Adjectives in Lope de Vega 398
Finn, Story of 418
Flaubert and War-Brides 183
——'s *Salammbô* 175
"Fléau" 96
Fletcher's *Women Pleased* 339
——, Massinger and —'s *Barnavelt* 470
Fleurs de France, Poésies lyriques depuis le Romantisme, 320
Folk-Lore Themes in Drama .. 339
Forgotten Lovelace MS 407
Fortunes of Lamartine in Spain, 458
Français, Écrivains — en Hollande 434
France, Cid Theme in —..... 296
——, Tassoni in —..... 447
France, Anatole 56, 248
Frank, Grace: N. C. Brooks, The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy with Special Reference to the Liturgic Drama 367
——: G. Cohen, Mystères et Moralités du manuscrit 617 de Chantilly 106
——: K. Young, The Dramatic Associations of the Easter Sepulchre 62
Freeman, A. M., Vanessa and Her Correspondence with Jonathan Swift 255
French, J. C.: R. L. Ramsay, Short Stories of America ... 502
——: C. Van Doren, The American Novel 115
French Classicism 244
—— Conversation and Composition 370

PAGE

French Literature.....64, 491
—— Lyric Poetry..... 320
—— Phrases..... 292
"Fuir" 96

Galerie du Palais..... 117
garçon 385
Ghost in *Hamlet*..... 185
Gillet, J. E., Church-and-Stage Controversy in Granada.... 284
——, Cueva's *Comedia del Infamador* and the Don Juan Legend 206
Glicksman, H., A Comment on Milton's *History of Britain*, 474
George, Stefan.....82, 313
German Carnival Comedy.... 40
—— Epic..... 17
—— Lexicography..... 390
—— Literature.....448, 482
—— Lyrics..... 431
Germanische Wortdeutungen.. .....215, 274
Germanisches Reckentum: frz. *garçon* 385
Geschichte der deutschen Literatur 482
Getchev, G.: H. V. Wann, French Conversation and Composition, 370
Goethe über seine Dichtungen, 300
Gollancz, Sir Israel, *Cleanness*, an Alliterative Tripartite Poem 355
Goode, C. T., Sir Thomas Elyot's *Titus and Gysippus*.... 1
Gowen, H. H., Jottings..... 183
Gräf, H. G. Goethe über seine Dichtungen 300
Granada 284
Grosseteste, Robert..... 49
Guilloux, P., L'Esprit de Renan, 428
Gulliver's Travels.....353, 416

Hamilton, G. L.: J. Murray, *Le château d'Amour* de Robert Grosseteste évêque de Lincoln 49
Hamlet 185
Hammond, E. P., Poems "Signed" by Sir Thomas Wyatt..... 505
Hanford, J. H., The Evening Star in Milton..... 444
Hardy, A., *La Follie de Clidamant* 121
Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter*... 58

PAGE

Haxo, H. E., Pierre Bayle and his Biographers..... 55
Heidelberger Romantik..... 482
Henning, G. N.: P. Hervieu, *La Course du flambeau*..... 511
Hervieu, P., *La Course du flambeau* 511
Heuser, F. W. J.: P. R. Lieder, Scott and Scandinavian Literature 303
Heywood, Thomas, as a Critic, 217
——, *The Captives; or the Lost Recovered* 63
"Hier" 96
Hill, J. M., Index Verborum de Covarruvias Orozco..... 320
Hills, E. C., Thomas Jefferson and Molière..... 443
——: J. M. Hill, Index Verborum de Covarruvias Orozco, 320
——: R. Schevill, The Dramatic Art of Lope de Vega, together with *la Dama boba*. Edited 167
History of Britain..... 474
Hochdeutsche Umgangssprache, 512
Hollande, Écrivains français en —..... 434
Hound of Heaven..... 124
Hughes, Helen S., A Letter to Richardson from Edward Young 314
Husbands, John..... 27

Immermann 482
Impromptu of Voltaire Completed 58
Index Verborum de Covarruvias Orozco 320

Jefferson, Thomas, and Molière. 443
Jespersen, O., Language: its Nature, Development, and Origin 379
Johnson, Samuel..... 11
Johnston, O. M., Note on *Por ce que, Parce que*, and *Pour que*, 310
Jottings 183
Judson, A. C., A Forgotten Lovelace Manuscript..... 407
——, Thomas Heywood, *The Captives; or the Lost Recovered* 63
Julius Caesar.....164, 374

PAGE

Kaye, F. B., Seventeenth Century Reference to Shakespeare, 248
Keats's *Ode to the Nightingale*, 476
Kelly, J. A., England and the Englishman in German Literature of the Eighteenth Century 448
Ker, W. P., Fleurs de France, Poésies lyriques depuis le Romantisme 320
Kern, A. A., *King Lear* and *Pelleas and Ettarre*..... 153
King Lear.....153, 346, 504
King's Daughter.....'.. 187
Klaeber, Fr., "Looking Under the Sun"..... 376
Kleist, Heinrich von..... 321
Kluge, F., Germanisches Rekkentum: frz. *garçon*..... 385
Knowlton, E. C., Causality in *Samson Agonistes*..... 333
Kosch, W., Geschichte der deutschen Literatur..... 482
Kretschmer, P., Wortgeographie der hochdeutschen Umgangssprache 512
Küchler, W., Ernest Renan, der Dichter und der Künstler.. 428
Kuhl, E. P., A Song and a Pun in Shakespeare..... 437
Kuhns, O., and H. W. Church, E. Rostand, *Cyrano de Bergerac*, 47
Kunstwerk, Das dichterische.. 362
Kurrelmeyer, W., German Lexicography, Part IV..... 390
——: P. Kretschmer, Wortgeographie der hochdeutschen Umgangssprache 512

La Fontaine, Fables de—..... 246
Lamartine in Spain..... 458
Lancaster, H. C., A Reply.... 118
——, Errors in Beauchamps' *Recherches sur les Théâtres de France*..... 466
——, Seventeenth-Century Prosody: "Hier"; "Fléau"; "Meurtrier"; "Fuir"..... 96
——: G. Cohen, Écrivains français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVIIe siècle, 434
——: O. Kuhns and H. W. Church, *Cyrano de Bergerac* par Edmond Rostand; A. G. H. Spiers, Edmond Rostand, *Cyrano de Bergerac*..... 47

PAGE

——: G. L. Van Roosbroeck, The Cid Theme in France in 1660; The Purpose of Corneille's *Cid*..... 296
——: C. H. C. Wright, French Classicism 244
Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech..... 188
——: its Nature, Development, and Origin..... 379
Lanson's Manuel bibliographique de la littérature française.. 64
Law, R. A., The Background of Browning's *Love Among the Ruins* 312
Le Buffe, F. P., *The Hound of Heaven:* An Interpretation, 124
Legend, Don Juan —..... 206
Letter to Richardson from Edward Young..... 314
Levin, H., Die Heidelberger Romantik 482
Lexicography, German..... 390
Lieder, P. R., Scott and Scandinavian Literature..... 303
Lincoln, Robert Grosseteste évêque de —..... 49
Literature, English..... 110
——, French.....64, 491
——, German.....448, 482
——, Scandinavian..... 303
Litz, F. A.: Jennie M. Tabb, Father Tabb, His Life and Work 255
Liturgic Drama..... 367
"Looking Under the Sun"... 376
Lope de Vega, Nouns and Adjectives in —..... 398
——'s Dramatic Art..... 167
——*la Dama boba*..... 167
Lost Epic..... 212
—— Play by A. Hardy..... 121
Love Among the Ruins..... 312
Lovejoy, A. O., Reply to Professor Babbitt..... 268
Lovelace Manuscript..... 407
Lycidas 470
Lyric Poetry, French..... 320
Lyrics, German..... 431

McCutcheon, R. P., Two Eighteenth-Century Emendations to *Chevy Chase*..... 436
Mackall, L. L.: H. G. Gräf, Goethe über seine Dichtungen. 300
McKillop, A. D., A Poem in the Collins Canon..... 181

PAGE

Manual de Pronunciación Española 227
Manuel bibliographique de la littérature française..... 64
Manuscript, Lovelace —..... 407
Mare and the Wolf..... 350
Marinoni, A., A Note on Maupassant 186
Martin, H. M., Termination of Qualifying Words before Feminine Nouns and Adjectives in the Plays of Lope de Vega, 398
Masefield's Vocabulary..... 148
Mason, J. F.: P. Guilloux, L'Esprit de Renan; L. F. Mott, Ernest Renan; W. Küchler, Ernest Renan, der Dichter und Künstler..... 428
Massinger and Fletcher's *Barnavelt* 470
Maupassant 186
Mayne, H., Immermann. Der Mann und sein Werk..... 482
Mediæval German Epic..... 17
Menner, R. J.: Sir Israel Gollancz, *Cleanness*, an Alliterative Tripartite Poem..... 355
Merrill, L. R., Vaughan's Influence upon Wordsworth's Poetry 91
Metaphysical Poets..... 11
Metre, Study of..... 59
"Meurtrier" 96
Middle French Phrases..... 292
Milton, The Evening Star in —, 444
——'s *Comus*, 93-94..... 118
——'s *History of Britain*.... 474
——'s *Lycidas* and the Play of *Barnavelt* 470
——'s Prosody..... 316
——'s *Samson Agonistes*..... 333
Molière, Jefferson, Thomas, and — 443
More's *Psychozoia*.....141, 379
Mott, L. F., Ernest Renan.... 428
Murray, Alma, and Shelley... 411
Murray, J., *Le château d'Amour* de Robert Grosseteste évêque de Lincoln..... 49
Murry, J. M., The Problem of Style 506
Mystères et Moralités du manuscrit 617 de Chantilly..... 106

Nethercot, A. H., The Term "Metaphysical Poets" before Johnson 11

PAGE

Nicolson, Marjorie N., More's *Psychozoia* 141
Note on *Julius Caesar*..... 164
—— on Maupassant..... 186
—— on *Por ce que, Parce que,* and *Pour que*..... 310
—— on Richard Crashaw..... 250
—— on *The Scarlet Letter*.... 58
Notes on Burns and England.. 76
—— on *King Lear*..... 346
Nouns in Lope de Vega..... 398
Novel, American..... 115

Ode to the Nightingale..... 476
Offa, Story of..... 418
Old American College Play... 157
—— English, Dative of Time How Long..... 129
—— French *aigre*, "vinegar," 438
—— —— Phrases..... 292
Omond, T. S., A Study of Metre 59
——, A Brief Rejoinder..... 181
Origin of the German Carnival Comedy 40
Origini di *Salammbô*..... 175

Painchaud, C. F..... 101
Pancoast, H. S., Did Wordsworth jest with Matthew?.. 279
Parce que..... 310
Patch, H. R.: R. W. Chambers, *Beowulf*, an Introduction to the Study of the Poem with a Discussion of the Stories of Offa and Finn..... 418
Pearl 355
Peers, E. A., The Fortunes of Lamartine in Spain..... 458
Pelleas and Ettare..... 153
Petit, Louis..... 307
Philetas 56
Philological Quarterly..... 254
Phrases of Asseveration and Adjuration 292
Play, Old American College —. 157
Poem in the Collins Canon... 181
Poems by T. Campbell..... 343
—— "Signed" by Sir Thomas Wyatt 505
Poésies lyriques..... 320
Poetry, Primitive..... 27
——, Wordsworth's..... 91
Poets, English..... 443
Por ce que..... 310
Porterfield, A. W.: H. Mayne, Immermann. Der Mann und sein Werk; H. Levin, Die Heidelberger Romantik; W.

PAGE

Kosch, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur; M. G. Bach, Wieland's Attitude toward Woman and her Cultural and Social Relations..... 482
Portmanteau Word of 1761: "Tomax" 377
Postliminear Corollarium for Coryate 53
Potter, G. R., "Sweet, Reluctant, Amorous Delay" among some Eighteenth-Century English Poets..... 443
Pour que..... 310
Préface des Fables de La Fontaine 246
Prepositional Phrases of Asseveration and Adjuration in Old and Middle French..... 292
Primitive Poetry..... 27
Problem of Style..... 506
Pronunciación Española..... 227
Prosody, Milton's..... 316
Psychozoia, More's.....141, 379
Pun in Shakespeare..... 437
Purpose of Corneille's *Cid*.... 296

Qualifying Words in Lope de Vega 398
Quem Quaeritis..... 289

Rabelais,—A Source for *Gulliver's Travels*..... 416
Ramsay, R. L., Short Stories of America..... 502
Rational and Emotional Elements in Heinrich von Kleist, 321
Raven, A. A., A Study in Masefield's Vocabulary..... 148
Rea, J. D., *Julius Caesar* II, i, 10-34 374
Recherches sur les Théâtres de France 466
Reckentum, germanisches..... 385
Renan, Ernest..... 428
Reply 118
—— to Professor Babbitt.... 268
Richardson, Samuel..... 314
Rimes of Stefan George....82, 313
Rôle of the Ghost in *Hamlet*.. 185
Romanticism, Schiller and —.. 257
Romantik, Heidelberger..... 482
Ross, E. C., A Note on *The Scarlet Letter*..... 58
Rostand, E., *Cyrano de Bergerac* 47

PAGE

Rowe, Mary B., Old French *aigre*, "vinegar,"..... 438
Rudmose-Brown, T. B., *La Galerie du Palais*..... 117
Rudwin, J. M., The Origin of the German Carnival Comedy, 40

St. Cuthbert and the King's Daughter 187
Sainte-Beuve 183
Salammbô 175
Sampson, G., English for the English 445
Samson Agonistes..... 333
Sapir, E., Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech, 188
Scandinavian Literature..... 303
Scarlet Letter, The..... 58
Schaffer, A., The *Trente-six ballades joyeuses* of Théodore de Banville 328
Schevill, R., The Dramatic Art of Lope de Vega, together with *la Dama boba*. Edited, 167
Schiffer, E., Tassoni in Frankreich 447
Schiller and Romanticism..... 257
Schoenemann, F.: J. A. Kelly, England and the Englishman in German Literature of the Eighteenth Century..... 448
Scogan's *Quem Quaeritis*..... 289
Scott and Scandinavian Literature 303
Scudéry's, Georges de, Lost Epic, 212
Semantic Analysis..... 251
Sepulchre, Easter —..... 62
—— of Christ in Art and Liturgy with Special Reference to the Liturgic Drama..... 367
Seventeenth Century Prosody, 96
—— —— Reference to Shakespeare 248
Shafer, R., Henry More's *Psychozoia* 379
Shakespeare, Dance of Death in — 372
——, references to —..... 248
——, Song and Pun in —.... 437
——'s *Coriolanus*..... 449
——'s *Hamlet*..... 185
——'s *Julius Caesar*.....164, 374
——'s *King Lear*....153, 346, 504
——'s Manipulation of his Sources in *As You Like It*.. 65
——'s Tragedies..... 449

PAGE

Shelley's Debt to Alma Murray, 411
Shorey, P., A Postliminear Corollarium for Coryate..... 53
Short Stories of America..... 502
Silz, W., Rational and Emotional Elements in Heinrich von Kleist..... 321
Smith, C. A., "Under the sonne he loketh"..... 120
Smith, T. R., Anthology of Swinburne's *Poems*..... 128
Snyder, E. D.: C. B. Tinker, Young Boswell: Chapters on James Boswell..... 498
Snyder, F. B., Notes on Burns and England..... 76
Social Relations of Woman... 482
Sodom, Destruction of..... 355
Song and a Pun in Shakespeare, 437
Source for *Gulliver's Travels*.. .....353, 416
Spain, Lamartine in —..... 458
Spanish Pronunciation..... 227
Speech, Study of..... 188
Spenser's *Fairy Queen*..... 223
Spiers, A. G. H., Edmond Rostand, *Cyrano de Bergerac*, 47
Stanza-Connection in the *Fairy Queen* 223
Starck, T., The Rimes of Stefan George..... 313
Starnes, D. T., An Erroneous Ascription to Wyatt..... 188
Stern, G., 'Swift,' 'Swiftly,' and their Synonyms..... 251
Structure of Shakespeare's Tragedies 449
Stuart, D. C.: J. M. Rudwin, The Origin of the German Carnival Comedy..... 40
Study in Masefield's Vocabulary, 148
—— of Metre..... 59
—— of Speech..... 188
Style, Problem of..... 506
Survey of English Literature, 1780-1880 110
Sutton, Mrs..... 193
"Sweet, Reluctant, Amorous Delay" among some Eighteenth-Century English Poets, 443
'Swift,' 'Swiftly,' and their Synonyms 251
Swift, Jonathan..... 255
——'s *Gulliver's Travels*..353, 416
Swinburne's *Poems*..... 128
Synonyms 251

PAGE

Tabb, Jennie M., Father Tabb, His Life and Work..... 255
Tamblyn, W. F., Notes on *King Lear* 346
Tassoni in Frankreich..... 447
Tatlock, J. S. P., "Under the Sonne" 377
Tennyson's *Pelleas and Ettare*, 153
Term "Metaphysical Poets" before Johnson..... 11
Termination of Qualifying Words before Feminine Nouns and Adjectives in the Plays of Lope de Vega..... 398
Théâtres de France..... 466
Theory, Semantic 251
Thompson's, Francis, *The Hound of Heaven*..... 124
Time How Long in Old English, 129
Tinker, C. B.: Young Boswell: Chapters on James Boswell, 498
Titus and Gysippus..... 1
Tolman, A. H., Shakespeare's Manupulation of his Sources in *As You Like It*..... 65
——, The Structure of Shakespeare's Tragedies with special reference to *Coriolanus*, 449
Tomás, T. Navarro, Manual de Pronunciación Española..... 227
"Tomax" 377
Towles, O., Prepositional Phrases of Asseveration and Adjuration in Old and Middle French, 292
Trente-six ballades joyeuses of Théodore de Banville..... 328
Tupper, J. W.: A. M. Freeman, Vanessa and Her Correspondence with Jonathan Swift.. 255

Umgangssprache, hochdeutsche, 512
Unacknowledged Poems by Thomas Campbell..... 343
'Under the sonne he loketh". 120
—— the Sonne"..... 376, 377

Van Doren, C., The American Novel 115
Van Roosbroeck, G. L., An Impromptu of Voltaire Completed, 58
——, Corneille's Relations with Louis Petit..... 307
——, The Cid Theme in France in 1660; The Purpose of Corneille's *Cid*..... 296

PAGE

——, A Lost Play by Alexandre Hardy: *La Follie de Clidamant* 121
——, Sylvestre Bonnard and the Fairy..... 248
—— Verses attributed to Voltaire 440
Vanessa and Her Correspondence with Jonathan Swift... 255
Vaughan's Influence upon Wordsworth's Poetry..... 91
Verses atributed to Voltaire.. 440
" vinegar," O. F. *aigre*, —.... 438
Vocabulary, Masefield's..... 148
Vogt, G. C., *The Wife of Bath's Tale, Women Pleased*, and *La Fée Urgele:* A Study in the Transformation of Folk-Lore Themes in Drama..... 339
Voltaire 58, 440
Vos, B. J.: F. Bruns, A Book of German Lyries..... 431
Voyage, Extraordinary..... 491

Wann, H. V., French Conversation and Composition..... 370
Wann, L., Milton's *Lycidas* and the Play of *Barnavelt*..... 470
War-Brides 183
White, N. I., Shelley's Debt to Alma Murray..... 411
Wieland's Attitude toward Woman 482
Wife of Bath's Tale, Women Pleased, and *La Fée Urgele:* A Study in the Transformation of Folk-Lore Themes in Drama 339
Williams, R. C.: E. Schiffer, Tassoni in Frankreich..... 447
Wise, T. J., A Catalogue of the Library of the late J. H. Wrenn 237
Withington, R., A Portmanteau Word of 1761: "Tomax"... 377
Woman, Cultural and Social Relations of..... 482
Women Pleased..... 339
Woodbridge, B. M., Flaubert and War-Brides..... 183
——, Sylvestre Bonnard and Philetas 56
Wordsworth and Matthew.... 279
——'s Poetry..... 91
Wortdeutungen, Germanische.. .....215, 274
Wortgeographie der hochdeutschen Umgangssprache..... 512
Wrenn, J. H., Library of —.. 237
Wright, C. H. C., French Classicism 244
Wyatt, Sir Thomas.....188, 505

Young, Edward..... 314
Young, K., The Dramatic Associations of the Easter Sepulchre 62

Zevdel, E. H., The Rimes of Stefan George..... 82

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Birkhead, Edith.—The Tale of Terror. A Study of the Gothic Romance. *London:* Constable & Co.; *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1921.

Brock, Cluton.—Essays on Books. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1921. $2.00.

Cazamian, Louis.—L'Evolution psychologique et la littérature en Angleterre, 1660-1914. *Paris:* Alcan, 1921. 9 fr.

Chevalley, Abel.—Le Roman Anglais de Notre Temps. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1921.

Chew, Samuel C.—Thomas Hardy, Poet and Novelist. [Bryn Mawr Notes and Monographs III.] *New York:* Longmans, Green & Co., 1921.

Christie, O. F.—England and the Eighteenth Century. Essays in Verse. *Oxford:* Blackwell, 1921. 6 sh.

Cohen, Helen Louise.—One-Act Plays by Modern Authors. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1921. $2.25.

Colvin, Sidney.—Memories and Notes of Persons and Places. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.

Danielson, Henry.—Bibliographies of Modern Authors. *New York:* James F. Drake, 1921.

Drinkwater, John.—Oliver Cromwell. A Play. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1921. $1.50.

Einstein, Lewis. — Tudor Ideals. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1921.

Erskine, John.—Books and Habits from the Lectures of Lafcadio Hearn. Selected and edited. *New York:* Dodd, Mead & Co., 1921.

Farmer, John S., and Henley, W. E.—A Dictionary of Slang and Colloquial English. (In one volume.) *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1921. $5.00.

Flemming, Jessie H.—England under the Lancastrians. *New York:* Longmans, Green & Co., 1921. $4.00.

Freeman, A. Martin.—Vanessa and her Correspondence with Jonathan Swift. Letters edited for the first time from originals. With an Introduction. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1921. $2.50.

Hammond, C. F. L.—English Composition: Progressive Exercises. With an Introduction by J. C. Smith. *Oxford:* Clarendon Press, 1921.

Leach, Henry Goddard.—Angevin Britain and Scandinavia. [Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, vol. VI.] *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press, 1921.

Lynd, Robert.—An Anthology of Modern Verse. With an Introduction. *London:* Methuen & Co., 1921. 6 sh.

Marsh, Elizabeth H.—Body and Soul. [A Play.] *Boston:* The Cornhill Co., 1921. $1.50.

Meyerstein, E. H. W.—Wade's Boat. A play or interlude. *London:* John Murray, 1921. 5sh.

Milford, Humphrey S.—Cowper, Prose and Verse, with Essays by Hazlitt and Bagehot. With Introduction and Notes. *Oxford:* Clarendon Press, 1921. 3 sh. 6 d.

Mordell, Albert.—The Literature of Ecstacy. *New York:* Boni & Liveright, 1921. $2.50.

Morley, Christopher. — Modern Essays. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1921. $2.00.

Newberry, John Strong.—Selected Poems and Ballads of Paul Port. Translated from the French. *New York:* Duffield & Co., 1921. $3.50.

Phillips, D. Rhys.—Lady Charlotte Guest and the Mabinogion. *Carmarthen:* Spurrell, 1921. 2 sh. 6 d.

Rhys, Grace.—The Children's Garland of Verse. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1921. $3.00.

Rothenstein, William.—Twenty-Four Portraits. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1921.

Saintsbury, George.—Minor Poets of the Caroline Period. Vol. III. *Oxford and New York:* The Clarendon Press, 1921.

Scudder, Vida D.—Le Morte d'Arthur of Sir Thomas Malory. A Study. *London:* J. M. Dent & Co., 1921. 10 sh. 6 d.

Somerset Dialect.—Selected Poems in Somerset Dialect. Somerset Folk Press, 1921. 1sh. 6d.

Still, Colin.—Shakespeare's Mystery Play. A Study of 'The Tempest.' *London:* Palmer, 1921. 12 sh. 6 d.

Strong, Archibald T. — Three Studies in Shelley and an Essay in Wordsworth and Meredith. *Oxford and New York:* Oxford University Press, 1921.

Tupper, Frederick.—Chaucer's Tale of Ireland. [Reprinted from the *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Association of America* XXXVI.]

Untermeyer, Louis. — Modern American Poetry. Revised and enlarged edition. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1921.

Vizatelly, Frank H.—Words we Misspell in Business. *New York:* Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1921. $1.50.

Yeats, William Butler.—Selected Poems. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1921.

GERMAN

Bischoff, Heinr.—Nikolaus Lenaus Lyrik. Ihre Geschichte, Chronologie und Textkritik. 2. Bd. *Berlin:* Weidmann, 1921. iii + 221 pp., 4to. M. 30.

Beck, Carl.—Gottfried Kellers Sieben Legenden. Diss. Teildruck. *Berlin:* 1919. Pp. 33-96.

Brodführer, Richard.—Untersuchung über die Entwicklung des Begriffes "guot" in Verbindung mit Personenbezeichnungen im Minnesange (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des älteren Minnesanges). Diss. Leipzig. *Halle:* 1917. 73 pp.

Braune, W.—Althochdeutsches Lesebuch. 8. Aufl. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1921. viii + 278 pp. M. 15.40.

Brüstle, Wilhelm.—Klopstock und Schubart Beziehungen in Leben und Dichten. Diss. München. *Augsburg:* 1917. 104 pp.

Chuquet, A.—Les Chants patriotiques de l'Allemagne, 1813-1918. *Paris:* E. Leroux, 1920. 316 pp. 16mo. Fr. 5.

Eckhard, Willy.—Die Technik in Zacharias Werners "Söhnen des Thals." Diss. Giessen. *Berlin:* Ebering, 1917. 92 pp.

Fischer, Rudolph.—Der Chor im deutschen Drama von Klopstocks Hermannsschlacht bis Goethes Faust II. Diss. *München:* 1917. 99 pp.

Frings, Thdr., u. Vandenheuvel, Jos.—Die südniederl. Munderten. Texte, Untersuchungen, Karten. 1. Tl.: Texte [Deutsche Dialektgeographie, 16. Hft.]. *Marburg:* Elwert, xxvii + 149 pp. M. 35.

Galaboff, K. S.—Die Stellung Fr. Schlegels und der anderen deutschen Romantiker zu Goethes "Wilhelm Meister" im Lichte des Ur-Meister. Diss. Kiel. *Göttingen:* 1917. viii + 103 pp.

Gräter, Reinhold.—Untersuchungen über den Silbenakzent schwäbisch-alemannischer Mundarten. Diss. Leipzig. *Görlitz:* 1917. 30 pp.

Hempel, Paul.—Die Kunst Friedrichs von Logau. Kap. I—V. Diss. *Berlin:* 1916. 130 pp.

Hirt, Herm.—Der indogermanische Vokalismus. [Indog. Bibl. Abt. I. Reihe I. Gramm. Bd. 13, T. 2]. *Heidelberg:* Winter, 1921. xi + 256 pp. M. 20.

Holl, Karl.—Goethe: Stoff, Gehalt, Form. Ein Beitrag zu Goethes Wortgebrauch und Ästhetik. Diss. *Berlin:* Weidmann, 1917. 43 pp.

Kadner, Siegfried.—G. A. Bürgers Einfluss auf A. W. Schlegel. Diss. Kiel. *Berlin:* 1919. 118 pp.

Kleinberg, Alfred.—Ludwig Anzengruber. Ein Lebensbild. Mit einem Geleitwort von Wilh. Bolin. *Stuttgart:* Cotta, 1921. xii + 448 pp. Bound, M. 60.

Loose, Emilie.—Hebbels Anschauungen über die ältere deutsche Literatur. Diss. *Heidelberg:* 1917. 66 pp.

Michael, Friedr. Die Anfänge der Theaterkritik in Deutschland. Diss. *Leipzig:* 1918. 110 pp.

Möckel, Karl.—Der Gedanke der Menschheitsentwickelung im Jungen Deutschland. Diss. *Leipzig:* 1916. 121 pp.

Pollmer, Arthur.—F. W. Riemer und seine "Mittheilungen über Goethe." [Probefahrten, 30. Bd.] *Leipzig:* Voigtländer, 1922. v + 140 pp. M. 26.

Roehl, M.—Die Doppelpersönlichkeit bei E. Th. A. Hoffmann. Diss. *Rostock:* [1916?] 60 pp.

Schewe, Harry.—Die Ballade "Es spielt ein Ritter mit einer Magd." Kap. I-III: Die Formen der deutschen Überlieferung. Diss. *Berlin:* 1917. 67 pp.

Sieburg, Fr.—Die Grade der lyrischen Formung. Beiträge zu einer Ästhetik des lyrischen Stils. Diss. Münster. *Stuttgart:* 1920. 48 pp.

Tögel, Friedr.—Das Problem der Erziehung bei Gottfried Keller. Diss. *Leipzig:* 1917. 76 pp.

Walther von der Vogelweide.—Gedichte. Hrsg. v. H. Paul. 5. Aufl. [Altdeu. Textbibl. Nr. 1]. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1921. iv + 211 pp. M. 12.

Zabel, Eugen.—Goethe und Napoléon. Versuch zur künstlerischen Lösung eines wissenschaftlichen Problems. *Berlin:* Staatspolit. Verlag, 1920. 40 pp. M. 5.

FRENCH

Anspach, F. W.—Schopenhauer u. Chamfort. Diss. *Göttingen:* Kaestner, 1914. 55 pp.

Argus, E.—C. Marot u. Margarete von Valois. Diss. *München:* Noske, 1918. 62 pp.

Bär, G.—Edgar Quinets "Ahasvérus" u. seine Beziehungen zu Quinets Geschichtsphilosophie. Diss. *Rostock:* Erben, 1917. 138 pp.

Breiner, A.—Die franz. Adjektiva fremdwörtlicher Herkunft aus dem Latein im Neufranzösischen. Heidelberg Diss. *Darmstardt:* G. Otto, 1914.

Bühler, K.—Ronsard u. seine Stellung zur mittelalterlichen französischen Literatur. Heidelberg Diss. *Frankfurt a. M.:* Eichhorn. 77 pp.

Cordemann, M.—Der Umschwung der Kunst zwischen der ersten u. zweiten Fabelsammlung La Fontaines. Diss. *München:* Wolf, 1917. 95 pp.

Deister, Bernhard.—Sprachliche Untersuchung des Abenteuerromans Robert le Diable. Diss. *Giessen:* v. Münchow, 1918. 82 pp.

Frahm, Wilhelm.—Das Meer und die Seefahrt in der altfranzösischen Literatur. Diss. *Göttingen:* Haensch, 1914. 151 pp.

Frenken, Goswin.—Die Exempla des Jacob von Vitry. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Erzählungsliteratur des Mittelalters. Teil I. Diss. *München:* Beck, 1914.

Grapengeter, C. — Die nordfranzösichen Elemente in Mistrals Werken. Kiel Diss. *Berlin:* Pass & Garleb, 1916. 75 pp.

Heege, W.—Die optischen u. akustischen Sinnesdaten in Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's "Paul et Virginie" u. Chateaubriand's "Atala." Tübingen Diss. *Stuttgart:* Liebich, 1917. 77 pp.

Hermann, Rudolf.—Das Subjektpronomen im altfranz. Rolandslied. Diss. Auszug. *Bonn:* 1921. 14 pp.

Kühl, Hans.—Das gegenseitige Verhältnis der Handschriften der Fassung II des festländischen Bueve de Hantone. Diss. *Göttingen:* Dietrich, 1915. 63 pp.

Kunz, K.—Die Sprache der mittelfranz. Sotties. Heidelberg Diss. *Freiburg i. Br.:* Hammerschlag & Kahle, 1915. 108 pp.

Lerch Eugen. — Einführung in das Altfranzösische. Texte, Uebersetzungen, Erläuterungen. *Leipzig-Berlin:* Teubner, 1921. vi + 161 pp. 21 M.

Mrodzinsky, C.—Die deutschen Übersetzungen der dramatischen Hauptwerke V. Hugo's. Diss. *Halle:* Hendrichs, 1915. viii + 154 pp.

Naudieth, F.—Der Trobador Guillem Magret. Königsberg Diss. *Halle:* Karras, 1913. 40 pp.

Paas, Erwin. — Das neutrale französische Pronomen le in prädikativer Verwendung. Diss. *Göttingen:* Huth, 1917. 179 pp.

Plate, R.—Voltaire als Epentheoretiker. Königsberg Diss. *Danzig:* Boenig, 1917. 235 pp.

Rhaue, Hans. — Über das Fabliau "Des Trois Aveugles de Compiègne" und Verwandte Erzählungen. Diss. *Braunsberg:* Heyne, 1914. 107 pp.

Rubensohn, G.—Die "Correspondance littéraire" Fr.-M. Grimm u. H. Meister. Diss. *Berlin:* Ebering, 1917. x + 173 pp.

Rümann. — Honoré Daumier sein Holzschnittwerk. Heidelberg Diss. *München:* Delphin-Verlag, 1914. 50 pp.

Schönberg, Richard.—Der Stil in den Epen des Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube: Girard de Viane u. Aymeri de Narbonne. Diss. *Halle:* Hohmann, 1914. 90 pp.

Ullrich, E. — Ch. B. Fagans Lustspiele. Leipzig Diss. *Dresden:* Petzschke & Gretschel, 1915. 129 pp.

Waldner, Leo. — Wace's Brut u. seine Quellen. Diss. *Karlsruhe:* Gutsch, 1914. 139 pp.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, V.—La vita. Introduzione e note di L. Negri. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1921. xxviii + 310 pp. L. 9. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, II.)

Ariosto, L.—Orlando Furioso, a cura di F. Martini. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia C., 1921. 564 pp. L. 12. (Biblioteca di Classici italiani.)

Biondi, D. — Un dimenticato (Silvestro Centofanti) nella vita e nell' opera letteraria. *Pisa:* E. Spoerri, 1921. 346 pp. L. 20.

Bruno, M. A. — La vita e gli scritti di Giambattista Giuliani (1818-1884). *Firenze:* Le Monnier, 1921. L. 6. (Biblioteca Nazionale.)

Bullough, E.—Cambridge Readings in Italian Literature. Edited by —. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1920. xviii + 335 pp.

Carli, A. de.—Autour de quelques traductions et imitations du théâtre français publiées à Bologne de 1690 à 1750. *Bologna:* Zanichelli, 1921. 48 pp.

Chroust, G.—Saggi. Letteratura italiana moderna. Da G. Carducci al futurismo. Con note biografiche, bibliografiche e dichiarative. Abt. 2. *Würzburg:* Kabitzsch und Mönnich, 1921. Pp. 153-280. M. 10.

Cippico, A.—Dante. Essays in Commemoration. 1321-1921. Edited for the Dante Sexcentenary Committee by — and others. *London:* University of London Press, 1921. vii + 255 pp.

Correa d'Oliveira, E.—Dante e Beethoven, con un saggio sul procmio dantesco. *Milano:* R. e C. Caddeo, 1921. 64 pp. L. 2.

Crepaldi, C. — Dante: la vita e l'opera. *Milano:* A. Vallardi, 1921. 144 pp. L. 5.

Del Lungo, I.—I Bianchi e i Neri. Pagine di storia fiorentina da Bonifacio VIII ad Arrigo VII per la vita di Dante. 2a edizione con correzioni e giunte. *Milano:* Hoepli, 1921. xii + 464 pp. L. 20. (Biblioteca storico-letteraria e dantesca.)

De Rubris, M.—Massimo d'Azeglio. Nel nome d'Italia. *Torino:* S. e C. Lattes, 1921. 80 pp. L. 20.

Donadoni, E.—Scritti e discorsi letterari. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1921. 416 pp. L. 10.

Farinelli, A.—Dante in Spagna, Francia, Inghilterra, Germania. Dante e Goethe. *Torino:* Fratelli Boeca, 1922. ix + 507 pp. L. 40.

Giuffrida, S.—Dante educatore. *Catania:* N. Giannotta, 1921. 70 pp. L. 2.50.

James-Grassi.—Dictionary of the English and Italian Languages. Fourteenth edition, entirely rewritten and greatly enlarged by Albert de Beaux. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1919. xii + 352 + 436 pp.

Lauria, A.—Tra spade e parrucche. Vita teatrale napoletana del secolo XVIII. *Milano:* A. Vallardi, 1921. 292 pp. L. 7.

Messedaglia, L. — Aleardo Aleardi, Caterina Bon-Brenzoni ed Angelo Messedaglia secondo documenti e carteggi inediti o rari. *Verona:* R. Cabianca, 1920. 144 pp. L. 5. (Repr. fr. the Atti dell' Academia di agricoltura, scienze e lettere di Verona, ser. IV, vol. XXII.)

Misciatelli, P.—Pagine dantesche. *Siena:* Giuntini Bentivoglio e C., 1921. L. 12.

Rossi, V.—Il codice latino 8568 della Biblioteca Nazionale di Parigi e il testo delle "Familiari" del Petrarca. *Roma:* Maglione e Strini, 1921. 37 pp. L. 17.50.

Tommaseo, N. — Dizionario dei sinonimi della lingua italiana. Nuova edizione. *Milano:* Bietti, 1921. lviii + 1330 pp. L. 18.

Vaccalluzzo, N. — Edmondo De Amicis. Discorso. *Catania:* N. Giannotta, 1921. 34 pp. L. 2.

Wilkins, E. H.—Dante: Poet and Apostle. *Chicago, Ill.:* The University of Chicago Press, 1921. ix + 89 pp. $1.25.

Zuccante, G.—Figure e dottrine nell' opera di Dante. *Milano:* Treves, 1921. xvi + 280 pp. L. 8.

SPANISH

Arriaga, E. de. — Compilación de varios artículos literarios del costumbrista bilbaíno y juicios crítico-biográficos acerca de este autor. *Bilbao:* Imp. Arechalde y Celorrio, 1920. 270 pp. 3 pes.

Catálogo general de la Biblioteca (de la) Gran Peña. Tomo I. *Madrid:* Valentín Tordesillas, 1920. 4to., 1304 pp.

Duque, M.—Flores de dichos y hechos sacados de varios y diversos autores. Lo publica por primera vez F. de P. Amat. *Valencia:* A. López y Ca., 1917. 4to., 262 pp.

Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J. — Cambridge Readings in Spanish Literature. Edited by —. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1921. 10sh.

García, D. S.—España en México. *Méjico:* Herreros Hermanos, sucesores, 1920. 4to., 114 pp.

González Martínez, E.—Poemas escogidos. Con un estudio de M. Toussaint. *Barcelona:* Maucci, 1920. 221 pp. 3.50 pes. (Colección de escritores americanos, VII.)

Hatheway, J., and Bergé-Soler, E.—Easy Spanish Reader. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1920. xiii + 386 pp.

Hermosilla, Diego de.—Diálogo de la vida de los pajes de palacio. Compuesto por —. Edited, with an introduction and notes, by D. Mackenzie. *Valladolid, España:* Viuda de Montero, 1916. 255 pp. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures, no. 7.)

La Fuente.—Diccionario enciclopédico ilustrado de la lengua española publicado bajo la dirección de Don José Alemany Bolufer y de varios reputados especialistas. *Barcelona:* Sopena, 1921. 1294 pp. En tela. 12.50 pes.

Linares Rivas, M.—Curros Enríquez. Discurso leído ante la Real Academia Española en la recepción del señor don — el día 15 de mayo de 1921. *Madrid:* V. Rico, 1921. 4to., 64 pp.

Menéndez Pidal, R.—El Cid en la historia. *Madrid:* Jiménez y Molina, 1921. 52 pp.

Mosucer Sans, R.—Antología escolar hispanoargentina para enseñanza secundaria y moral. *Buenos Aires:* Angel Estrada y Ca., 1920. 4to., xii + 286 pp.

Ors, E. d'.—El nuevo glosario. Primer volumen. *Madrid:* R. Caro Raggio, 1921. 217 pp. 5 pes.

Ponce de Leon, N. — Technological Dictionary, English-Spanish and Spanish-English. 2 vols. *London:* Hirschfeld, 1921. 90sh.

Pulido, A.—Desarrollo, esplendor y soberanía de la lengua española. Mensaje dirigido al señor don Antonio Maura, Presidente de la Real Academia de la Lengua, y a los señores Académicos de la misma. *Madrid:* Impr. del Sucesor de Enrique Teodoro, 1921. 88 pp.

Quesada, E.—Rafael Obligado. El poeta. El hombre. *Buenos Aires:* "Coni," 1920. 4to., 87 pp.

San Juan de la Cruz, Fr. Gerardo de.—Nueva luz sobre la familia del insigne poeta toledano Baltasar Eliseo de Medinilla y particularmente sobre su muerte y matador. *Toledo:* Del Amo, 1920. 4to., 31 pp. 1 pes.

Santos Coco, F. — Historia silense. Edición preparada por —. *Madrid:* Sucesores de Rivadeneyra, 1921. xliv + 111 pp. (Junta para ampliación de estudios e investigaciones científicas. Centro de estudios históricos.) 5 pes.

Serrano Sanz, M.—Estudio crítico de las obras de Sor Teresa de Jesús María, Carmelita descalza del siglo XVII, trasladadas ahora de sus manuscritos originales y por primera vez impresas. *Madrid:* J. Pueyo, 1921. xxviii + 441 pp. 6 pes.

Zauner, A.—Altspanisches Elementarbuch. Zweite, umgearbeitete Auflage. *Heidelberg:* C. Winter, 1921. xii + 192 pp. M. 24.40. (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, hrsg. von W. Meyer-Lübke. 1. Reihe: Grammatiken, 5. Band.)

GENERAL

Phillmore, J. S.—Philostratus' Apollonius of Tyana. Translated, with Preface, Introduction, Notes, and Index. 2 vols. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1921.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Baskerville, Charles Read.—English Songs of the Night Visit. [*Reprinted from PMLA.* XXXVI.]

Bolenius, Emma Miller.—Advanced Lessons in Everyday English. *New York:* The American Book Co., 1921.

Braithwaite, W. S.—Anthology of Magazine Verse for 1921. *Boston:* Small, Maynard Co., 1921.

Brett-Smith, H. F. B. — Peacock's Four Ages of Poetry; Shelley's Defence of Poetry; Browning's Essay on Shelley. Edited. *Oxford:* Blackwell, 1921. 4sh. 6d.

Brown, Basil.—Law Sports at Gray's Inn (1594). *New York:* Unity Press, 1921. $3.00.

Burdette, Osbert.—The Idea of Coventry Patmore. *Oxford:* University Press, 1921. $3.75.

Cook, Albert S.—The Old English Physiologus, Text and Prose Translation; Verse Translation by James Hall Pitman. [Yale Studies in English, LXIII.] *New Haven:* Yale University Press, 1921.

Dibble, Roy F.—Albion W. Tourgée. Columbia University Dissertation. *New York:* Lemcke & Buechner, 1921.

Eastman, Max. — The Sense of Humor. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.

Emerton, Ephraim.—Learning and Living. *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press, 1922. $3.00.

Herford, Oliver. — The Herford Aesop. *New York:* Ginn & Co., 1921.

Holmes, Mabel Dodge.—The Poet as Philosopher. A Study of Three Philosophical Poems: Nosce Teipsum; The Essay on Man; In Memoriam. Dissertation. *Philadelphia:* University of Pennsylvania, 1921.

Keats.—The John Keats Memorial Volume. *London:* John Lane, 1921. 25 sh.

Lee, Sir Sidney. — The Year's Work in English Studies, 1919-1920. Edited for the English Association. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1921. 6 sh.

Legg, L. G. Wickham. — Matthew Prior. *Cambridge:* University Press; *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1922.

MacCollough, Martin. — Letters on Contemporary American Authors. *Boston:* Four Seas Publishing Co., 1922. $2.00.

MacGowan, Kenneth. — The Theatre of To-Morrow. *New York:* Boni & Liveright, 1922. $5.00.

McKerrow, R. B.—Note on the Teaching of "English Language and Literature." *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1921. 2 sh. 6 d.

Nathan, George Jean.—The Critic and the Drama. *New York:* A. Knopf, 1922. $1.75.

Newbolt, Henry.—An English Anthology of Prose and Poetry. *New York:* E. P. Dutton Co., 1921. $5.00.

Ord, Hubert.—Chaucer and the Rival Poet in Shakespeare's Sonnets. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1922. $1.25.

Rhys, Grace.—The Children's Garland of Verse. *London:* J. M. Dent & Co., 1921. 7 sh. 6 d.

Sampson, George.—English for the English. A chapter on National Education. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1921. 5 sh.

Sherman, Stuart P.—Essays and Poems of Emerson. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922.

Smith, J. C.—A Book of Verse from Langland to Kipling. *Oxford:* University Press, 1921. $1.60.

Snider, Denton J.—Ralph Waldo Emerson. *St. Louis:* The Williams, Harvey, Miner Co., 1921. $1.50.

Squire, J. C.—A Book of Women's Verse. *Oxford:* University Press, 1921.

Stalker, Archibald.—The Intimate Life of Sir Walter Scott. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1921.

Strong, Archibald. — Three Studies in Shelley. And an essay on Nature in Wordsworth and Meredith. *London:* H. Milford, 1921. 10 sh. 6 d.

Taylor, G. R. Stirling.—Modern English Statesmen. *New York:* Robert McBride & Co., 1921. $2.75.

Thomas, C. S. and Paul, H. G.—Story, Essay and Verse. A textbook in Literary Form. Literary material from the *Atlantic Monthly.* Selected and edited. *Boston:* The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1921.

Williams, W. H.—Trivia: or the Art of Walking the Streets of London. *London:* Daniel O'Connor, 1921.

GERMAN

Arndt, E. M.—Über den deutschen Studentenstaat. Hrsg. v. H. Wienkötter. *Leipzig:* C. Fr. Fleiseher, 1921. x + 46 pp. M. 8.

Berger-Wollner, M. — Die Gedichte des Wilden Alexander. Diss. Teildruck. *Berlin:* 1916. 54 pp.

Borcherdt, H. H. — Die ersten Ausgaben von Grimmelshausens Simplicissimus. Eine kritische Untersuchung. Mit 9 Nachbildungen. *München:* H. Stobbe, 1921. 64 pp. M. 40.

Ermatinger, E.—Das dichterische Kunstwerk. Grundbegriffe der Urteilsbildung in der Literaturgeschichte. *Leipzig:* B. G. Teubner, 1921. viii + 405 pp. M. 40.

Gemmingen, Otto v.—Vico, Hamann und Herder. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Erneuerung des deutschen Geisteslebens im 18. Jh. Diss. München. *Leipzig:* 1918. 51 pp.

Goethe's Ehe in Briefen. Hrsg. von H. G. Gräf. Mit 8 Tafeln. *Frankfurt a. M.:* Rütten & Loening, 1921. xii + 587 pp. M. 60.

Gundolf, Fr.—Dichter und Helden. *Heidelberg:* Weisssche Univ. Buchh. 1921. 79 pp. M. 10.

Haller, Paul.—Pestalozzis Dichtung. *Zürich:* Orell Füssli, 1921. ii + 142 pp. M. 12.

Hauffen, A.—Johann Fischart. Ein Literaturbild aus der Zeit der Gegenreformation. Bd. 1. *Berlin:* Ver. wissensch. Verleger, 1921. xi + 290 pp. M. 48.

Humboldt's, Wilh. v., gesammelte Schriften. Hrsg. v. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 13. Bd., Nachträge. *Berlin-Steglitz:* B. Behr, 1920. iv + 320 pp. M. 12 + 50%.

Klein, Hans. — Die antiken Amazonensagen in der deutschen Literatur. Diss. München. *Leipzig:* 1919. 170 pp.

Prag.—Die Entstehung und Rechtsstellung der deutschen Universität in Prag. Hrsg. vom akad. Senat. *Prag:* Verl. "Deutsche Arbeit," 1919. 24 pp., M. 1.50.

Schneider, Manfred. — Einführung in die neuste deutsche Dichtung. *Stuttgart:* W. Meyer-Ilschen [1921]. 129 pp. M. 18.

Walter, Karl.—Aus Mörikes Bräutigamszeit mit unveröffentlichten Briefen. *Ludwigsburg:* C. F. Schulz, 1921. 16 pp. M. 3.50.

Weimann-Bischoff, Anna.—Gottfried Keller und die Romantik. Münchener Diss. *Leipzig:* 1917. 95 pp.

FRENCH

Armand, E. C.—Grammaire élémentaire; deuxième année. *Boston:* Heath, 1921. x + 288 pp. $1.56.

Duclaux, Mary. — Victor Hugo. *New York:* Holt, 1921. $3.

Ghiotti, C., e Dogliani, G.—La langue et la littérature française dans tous les siècles. Ad uso dei corsi universitari e degli aspiranti al diploma di abilitazione all'insegnamento. *Torino:* G. B. Petrini, di G. Gallizio, 1921. 3 vols. 1855 pp. L. 25.

Greiner, W. — Owein-Ivain. Neue Beiträge zur Frage nach der Unabhängigkeit der kymrischen Mabinogion von den Romanen Chrestiens. Erster Teil. Diss. (also in Zeit. f. celt. Philol., XII). *Halle:* Karras, 1917. 185 pp.

Hager, W.—Bergson als Neu-Romantiker mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von M. Maeterlinck. Diss. *München:* Frölich, 1916. viii + 80 pp.

Hasselmann, Fritz.—Über die Quellen der Chronique rimée von Philippe Mousket. Diss. *Göttingen:* Dietrichsche Univ.-Buchdruckerei, 1916. 91 pp.

Hastings, W. S.—The Drama of Honoré de Balzac. Johns Hopkins Diss. *Baltimore:* 1917. 158 pp.

Haustein, M.—Die franz. Literatur im Urteil der englischen Romantiker Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey. Halle Diss. *Halle:* Hohmann, 1917. 127 pp.

Hilka, Alfons, ed. — Der altfranzösische Prosa-Alexanderroman. Nach der Berliner Bilderhandschrift nebst dem lat. Original der Historia de Preliis . . hrsg. (Festschrift f. Carl Appel z. 17. V. 1917). *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1920. L + 290 pp. 50 M.

Hinkfoth, Otto.—Branche IV des Couronnement de Louis. Diss. *Rostock:* Schröder, 1917. 116 pp.

Jourdain, E. F. — Dramatic Theory and Practice in France, 1690-1808. *New York:* Longmans, Green, 1921. x + 240 pp. $4.25.

Krämer, T.—Das romantische Ritterepos bei Fouqué. Diss. *Münster:* Regensbergsche Buchdruckerei, 1913. 87 pp.

Luitz, F. — Die Ästhetik von Théophile Gautier. Diss. Heidelberg. *Freiburg:* Günter & Renner. 156 pp.

Maurer, C.—Das persönliche Element in den Werken Leconte de Lisle's. Diss. *Heidelberg:* Rössler & Herbert, 1917. 63 pp.

Morillot, P.—Le roman français; durant l'époque classique; 1610-1800. *New York:* Dutton, 1921. xiii + 347 pp. $2.25.

Nicholson, H. — Paul Verlaine. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin, 1921. 271 pp. $5.

Sand, George.—La Mare au Diable, ed. with introd., notes, vocab., ex. by L. R. and R. L. Gregor. *New York:* Ginn, 1921. xii + 162 pp.

Schätzle, A. — Balzac als Naturalist in seiner Darstellung der Frauenliebe. Diss. *Heidelberg:* Rössler & Herbert, 1914. 59 pp.

Schiebries, F.—Victor Hugo's Urteile über Deutschland. Diss. *Königsberg:* Hartung, 1914. 87 pp.

Solltmann, Idamarie. — Die Rektion der Ausdrücke der Furcht im Französischen. Diss. *Göttingen:* Dietrich, 1918. 65 pp.

Splittgerber, Walter.—Die frz. Nachahmungen des Eulenspiegel in ihrem Verhältniss unter sich und zum deutschen Volksbuch. Diss. *Greifswald:* 1921. 82 pp.

Strempel, A.—Giraut de Salignac. Rostock Diss. *Leipzig:* Hoffmann, 1916. 106 pp.

Sternberg, Else. — Das Tragische in den Chansons de Geste. Diss. *Berlin:* Mayer u. Müller, 1915. 206 pp.

Stüwe, Erich.—Die frz. Lehnwörter u. Namen in der mittelgriechischen Chronik von Morea. Diss. Preisschrift. *Rostock:* 1921. xii + 168 pp.

Turquet-Milnes, G.—Some modern French writers (Barrès, Bourget, France, Claudel, Moréas, etc.). *New York:* McBride, 1921. xiii + 302 pp. $2.50.

Weil, Alice.—Die Sprache des Gilles de Chin von Gauthier de Tournay (Laut- u. Flexionslehre). Diss. *Heidelberg:* Rössler u. Herbert, 1916. 123 pp.

ITALIAN

Alajmo, M. — Le correzioni ai Promessi sposi e il realismo del Manzoni. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1921. 120 pp. L. 6.

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia commentata da C. Steiner. Vol. I: Inferno. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1921. 354 pp. L. 9.

Ariosto, L.—L'Orlando furioso. *Milano:* Sonzogno, 1921. 436 pp. L. 3.50. (Biblioteca classica, n. 12.)

Bovio, L.—Teatro. Vol. I. *Napoli:* L. Pierro, 1921. 370 pp. L. 8.

Caterina da Siena. — Lettere scelte con note di N. Tommaseo. Introduzione di S. Fino. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1920. xxxviii + 214 pp. L. 6. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, XVII.)

Ceroni, Gina.—Pensiero e parola. Come impariamo a pensare e a parlare. *Como:* L. di R. Mazzoletti, 1921. 86 pp. L. 7.

Cesareo, G. A.—Saggio su l'arte creatrice. Ristampa. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1921. 350 pp. L. 18.

Cortese, G. C. (Fil. Sgruttendio).—Il gran Cortese e la Tiorba a taccone, per la prima volta riordinata e corretta, con note illustrative e glossario, da F. Russo. *Napoli:* G. Giannini, 1920. 2 vols., 525 pp. L. 12.

D'Angelo, P. — Riassunto dei Promessi sposi di A. Manzoni. *Catania:* N. Giannotta, 1921. 120 pp. L. 5.50.

Della Casa, G. — Il galateo. Con introduzione e note di U. Scoti-Bertinelli. Nuova edizione. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1921. 160 pp. L. 6. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

Filippini, F. — L'esodo degli studenti da Bologna nel 1321 e il Polifemo dantesco. *Bologna:* L. Cappelli, 1921. 84 pp. L. 5.

Fornaciari, R.—Il canto XVIII dell' Inferno letto nella Casa di Dante in Roma. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1921. 31 pp. L. 3. (Lectura Dantis.)

Gillet, L.—Le Tasse à l'abbaye de Châalis. *Abbeville:* Paillart, 1921. 32 pp.

Gioberti, V.—Del primato morale e civile degli Italiani. Introduzione e note di G. Balsamo-Crivelli. Vol, I-III. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1920. L. 24. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, XXIV-XXVI.)

Giordano, D. — Leonardo Fioravanti bolognese (medico e scrittore). *Bologna:* L. Cappelli, 1920. 80 pp. L. 4.

Giovannozzi, G.—Il canto XXIV del Paradiso letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1921. 40 pp. L. 3. (Lectura Dantis.)

Guicciardini, F.—Ricordi politici e civili. Introduzione e note di A. Faggi. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1921. xii + 122 pp. L. 5. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, XXXI.)

Leopardi, G. — Il testamento letterario. Pensieri dello Zibaldone scelti, annotati e ordinati in sei capitoli. *Roma:* La Ronda, 1921. 228 pp. L. 10.

Marenduzzo, A. — I periodi della letteratura italiana. Vol. III: L'umanesimo e il Rinascimento, sec. XV. *Livorno:* R. Giusti, 1921. 65 pp. L. 1.50. (Biblioteca degli studenti, n. 489.)

Ravello, F.—La grande voce nel VI centenario della morte di Dante (1321-1921). Discorso commemorativo. *Ivrea:* F. Viassone, 1921. 44 pp. L. 4.

Rondanini, A.—L'anconetano chic in Dalmazia. Poesie semi-dialettali anconetane. *Ancona:* G. Fogola, 1921. 56 pp. L. 3.

Santanera, A. — L'amore passionale: sul canto V dell'Inferno. La visione di Dio: sul canto XXXIII del Paradiso. *Torino:* Lattes, 1921. 61 pp. L. 4.

Sciuto, S.—La Divina Commedia esposta in prosa. *Torino*. Società editrice internazionale, 1921. 284 pp. L. 10.

Vasari, G.—Le vite dei più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architetti, ridotte e annotate a cura di G. Urbini. Nuova edizione. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1921. 302 pp. L. 8. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

Vitaletti, G.—Laudi spirituali. Prefazione di —. *Firenze:* G. Giannini e figlio, 1921. (Fiori di letteratura ascetica e mistica, n. 14.)

SPANISH

Austria, J.—Condiciones del ambiente intelectual de las sociedades en las épocas de intensa producción literaria. Discurso leído en la Academia Venezolana, en la recepción pública del señor don —, el día 10 de abril de 1921. *Caracas:* Lit. del Comercio, 1921. 4to., 43 pp.

Bonaechea, J.—Serranía de Ronda. Novelillas y cuentos andaluces. *Madrid:* V. H. de Sanz Calleja, 1921. 187 pp. 3.50 pes.

Carrere, E.—Retablillo grotesco y sentimental. *Madrid:* Mundo Latino, 1921. 236 pp. 3.50 pes.

Fernán Caballero.—Deudas pagadas. Con un prólogo de D. Manuel Cañete. *Madrid:* Rubiños, 1921. 198 pp. 4 pes. (Obras completas, XIII.)

Foulché-Delbosc, R.—Catalogue de la bibliothèque hispanique de —. *Abbeville:* Paillart, 1920. 558 pp.

García Romero, F.—Catálogo de los incunables existentes en la biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia. *Madrid:* Editorial Reus, 1921. 4to., 182 pp. 25 pes.

González Palencia, A. — Testamento de Juan López de Hoyos, maestro de Cervantes. *Madrid:* Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1921. 4to., 13 pp.

Navarro Tomás, T.—Cantidad de las vocales inacentuadas. *Madrid:* Impr. de los Sucesores de Hernando, 1917. 4to., 18 pp.

—— Diferencias de duración entre las consonantes españolas. *Madrid:* Impr. de los Sucesores de Hernando, 1918. 4to., 27 pp.

—— Historia de algunas opiniones sobre la cantidad silábica española. *Madrid:* Impr. de los Sucesores de Hernando, 1921. 4to., 28 pp.

—— Sobre la articulación de la I castellana. *Barcelona:* Impr. de la Casa de Caritat, 1917. 4to., 15 pp.

Rolando, C. A.—Cronología del periodismo ecuatoriano. Pseudónimos de la Prensa nacional. *Guayaquil:* Imp. Monteverde y Velarde, 1920. 166 pp.

Tortosa, D.—Cuatro discursos. *Madrid:* Imp. Clásica Española, 1920. 93 pp.

Valencia Castañeda, B.—Crónicas de antaño tocantes a la M. N. y M. L. villa—ciudad después—de Medina de Rioseco, sacadas del archivo municipal por Mancio de Prado, y publicadas por —. Con prólogo de N. Alonso Cortés. *Valladolid:* Imprenta Viuda de Montero, 1915. xii + 238 pp. (Sociedad de Estudios Históricos Castellanos.)

Vargas Vila, J. M.—Rubén Darío. Edición definitiva. *Barcelona:* R. Sopena, 1921. 247 pp. 3 pes. (Obras completas, XXXV.)

Vélez de Guevara, L.—El diablo cojuelo. *Madrid:* Imp. Clásica Española, 1921. 251 pp. 2 pes.

Vicuña Cifuentes, J. — Versificación castellana. Sobre el imaginario verso yámbico de trece sílabas. *Santiago de Chile:* Impr. Universitaria, 1918. 4to., 23 pp.

Villalpando, S. I. Y.—Estudio ortográfico. Proyecto de reforma. México. Méjico. Contra una reforma. *México:* "Hesperia," 1921. 4to., 6 pp.

Zurita Nieto, J.—Apuntes documentados sobre el año de la muerte del Conde Don Pedro Assurez y acerca de su sepultura, epitafio y aniversario en la S. I. M. de Valladolid. *Valladolid:* Imp. Castellana, 1918. 126 pp. (Sociedad de Estudios Históricos Castellanos.)

ROMANCE

Behrens, D., ed.—Giessener Beiträge zur Romanischen Philologie. Heft 1: W. Ochs. Die Bezeichnungen der "Wilden Rose" im Galloromanischen. 32 pp. M. 6.—Heft 2. A. Prein, Syntaktisches aus frz. Soldatenbriefen. M. 10.—Heft. 3. W. Gottschalk, Lat. "audire" im Frz. *Giessen:* Selbstverlag des Romanischen Seminars, Ludwigstr. 19, 1921.

Döttling, Chr. — Die Flexionsformen lat. Nomina in den griechischen Papyri und Inschriften. Diss. *Basel:* 1921. 124 pp.

Gamillscheg, E., und Spitzer, L.—Beiträge z. romanischen Wortbildungslehre. (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum Romanicum." Serie II, Linguistica 2.). *Firenze:* Olschki, 1921. vi + 206 pp. 30 L.

Hebeisen, Walter.—Die Bezeichnungen für Geschirr, Eimer, Krug im Französischen, Oberitalienischen u. Rätoromanischen. Diss. *Bern:* 1921. 68 pp.

Meyer-Lübke, W. — Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft. 3., neu bearb. Aufl. (Sammlung Rom. Elementar- u. Handbücher, I, 1). *Heidelberg:* Winter, 1921. xvi + 301 pp. M. 21 + 20%.

Pauli, Ivan.—"Enfant," "garçon," "fille" dans les langues romanes. Essai de lexicologie comparée. *Lund:* Lindstedt, 1919. 426 pp. Kr. 10.

Rohlfs, G. — Ager, Area, Atrium. Eine Studie zur romanischen Wortgeschichte. Berlin Dissertation. 1920. 69 pp.

GENERAL

Butler, Nicholas Murray. — Scholarship and Science. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921. $2.50.

Myerson, Abraham.—The Foundations of Personality. *Boston:* Little, Brown & Co., 1921. $2.25.

Palmer, Harold E.—The Oral Method of Teaching Languages. *Cambridge:* W. Heffer & Sons, 1921. 5 sh.

Prickard, A. O. — Longinus on the Sublime. Translated, with Specimens from Greek literary critics, Latin critics, Bishop Lowth. *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1921.

Sapir, Edward.—Language. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1921. $1.75.

Schrijnen, Jos.—Einführung in das Studium der indogerm. Sprachwissenschaft, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der klassischen und german. Sprachen. Uebersetzt von Walter Fischer. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1921.

Spence, Lewis.—An Introduction to Mythology. *New York:* Moffat, Yard Co., 1921.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Bax, C. and Rubenstein, H. F.—Shakespeare. A play. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1922. $1.50.

Bishoffberger, Elsie.—Der Einfluss John Skeltons auf die Englische Literatur. Dissertation. *Freiburg i. B.:* 1914.

Broadus, E. K.—The Laureateship. *Oxford:* Clarendon Press, 1921. 15 sh.

Brooks, Neil C.—The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy, with special reference to the Liturgic Drama. [University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. VII, no. 2.] *Urbana:* University of Illinois, 1921.

Carmen, Bliss.—Later Poems. *Toronto:* McClellan & Stewart, 1922.

Chamberlin, Frederick.—The Private Life of Queen Elizabeth. *London:* John Lane, 1921.

De la Mare, Walter.—The Veil and Other Poems. *London:* Constable & Co., 1921. 6 sh.

Duffin, H. C.—Thomas Hardy: A Study of Wessex Novels. Second edition, with an appendix on the Poems and *The Dynasts. Manchester:* University Press; *New York:* Longmans, Green & Co., 1921.

English.—Standard Usage in English. By the Department of English, University High School, University of Chicago. *Chicago:* University Press, 1922. 25 cts.

English.—The Teaching of English in England. Being the Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Education. *London:* His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1921.

English Association.—Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, vol. VII. Collected by John Bailey. *Oxford:* Clarendon Press, 1922. 7sh. 6d.

Fernald, James C. — Historic English. *New York:* Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1921.

Feuillerat, Albert.—The Complete Works of Sir Philip Sidney. In three vols; vol. II, reprinted. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1922. 12sh. 6d.

Grierson, H. J. C.—Lord Byron, Arnold, and Swinburn. Pamphlet. *Oxford:* University Press, 1922.

Grierson, Herbert J. C. — Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century. Selected and edited. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1921.

Hyamson, A. M.—A Dictionary of English Phrases. *London:* Routledge, 1921. 12sh. 6d.

Jespersen, Otto.—Language: its Nature, Development, and Origin. *London:* George Allen & Unwin, 1922. 18sh.

Kenyon, Sir F. G.—The Fellowship of Learning. Pamphlet. *Oxford:* University Press, 1922.

Lennard, S. A.—The Atlantic Book of Modern Plays. Collected and edited. *Boston:* Atlantic Monthly Press, 1922. $2.00.

Liljegren, S. B.—American and European in the Works of Henry James. [Lunds Universitets Årsskrift.] *Leipzig:* Otto Harrassowitz, 1922.

Lyon, Leverett S.—Elements of Debating. *Chicago:* University Press, 1922. $1.25.

Masefield, John.—Esther and Bernice. 2 plays. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1922. $2.00.

Newbolt, Henry.—Poems New and Old. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1922. $3.00.

Notcutt, H. Clement.—The Story of Glaucus in Keats's 'Endymion.' *South Africa:* Stellenbosch University, 1921.

Phillips, William S.—Carols: their Origin, Music and Connection with the Mystery Plays. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1922. $3.00.

Pound, Ezra.—Poems, 1918-21, including Three Portraits and Four Cantos. *New York:* Boni & Liveright, 1922. $2.50.

Ramsay, Robert Lee.—Short Stories of America. Edited with an Introductory Essay, Course Outline, and Reading Lists. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1922. $1.44.

Roe, Frederick William. — The Social Philosophy of Carlyle and Ruskin. *London:* Allen & Unwin, 1922. 12sh. 6d.

Sampson, George.—English for the English. A chapter on National Education. *Cambridge:* University Press; *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1921.

Spaar, Otto.—Prolog und Epilog im mittelalterlichen englischen Drama. Dissertation, Giessen University. *Grünebcrg:* H. Robert, 1913.

Spaeth, J. Duncan.—Old English Poetry. Translations into Alliterative Verse, with Introduction and Notes. *Princeton:* University Press, 1922.

Stern, Gustaf. — Swift, Swiftly, and their Synonyms: a contribution to Semantic Analysis and Theory. [Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, 1921, III.] *Göteborg:* Wettergren & Kerber, 1921.

Talley, Thomas J.—Negro Folk Rhymes. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1922. $2.25.

Walters, L. D'O.—Irish Poets of To-day. *London:* T. Fisher Unwin, 1921. 6sh.

FRENCH

Aurenche, L.—Un dernier ami de J.-J. Rousseau, le chevalier de Flamanville, 1751-1779. *Evreux:* Impr. de l'Eure, 1921. 24 pp.

Baudelaire, Ch.—Les Fleurs du mal. Ed. du centenaire par Pierre Dufay. *Paris:* Libr. des bibliophiles parisiens, 1921. cviii + 349 pp.

Betbeder-Matibet, Marie. — L'Influence de Shakespeare sur Musset dans les comédies et proverbes. *Paris:* Didier, 1921. 47 pp. Fr. 2.

Bouillier, V. — La Renommée de Montaigne en Allemagne. *Paris:* Champion, 1921. 64 pp.

Catalogue général des livres impr. de la Bibl. nationale. T. 74. Hovaeus-Hunzinger. *Paris:* Imp. nat., 1921.

Couronnement de Louis, le.—Chanson de geste du XIIIe siècle, éd. par E. Langlois. *Paris:* Champion, 1920.

Doumergue, E.—Le Caractère de Calvin; le Style et l'Homme; le Théologien; l'Organisateur des églises et de la société. *Paris:* éditions de Foi et Vie, 1921. 108 pp.

Florian.—Fables précédées d'une étude sur la fable par E. Gérusez. *Paris:* Hachette, 1920. xv + 140 pp.

Florilège des poètes du "Verbe." Préface de F. Gregh. *Paris:* les éds. fr. "les Gémeaux," 1921. vii + 197 pp. Fr. 5.

Franklin, A.—Paris et les Parisiens au XVIe siècle. *Paris:* Emile-Paul frères, 1921. xxii + 538 pp. Fr. 12.

Jouhandeau, M.—La Jeunesse de Théophile. *Paris:* Nouvelle revue française, 1921 (2d ed.). 235 pp. Fr. 7.50.

La Bruyère.—Introd., bibliographie, notes, grammaire, lexique et illustrations documentaires par R. Radouant. *Paris:* Hatier, 1920. xvi + 744 pp.

Lanson, G.—Manuel bibliographique. Nouvelle édition revue et augmentée avec un chapitre complémentaire sur le mouvement litt. au début du XXe siècle et sur la litt. de guerre. *Paris:* Hachette, 1921. 4 vols. 1536 pp. Fr. 80.

Marivaux.—Le spectateur français. Introd. et notes de P. Bonnefon. *Paris:* Bossard, 1921. 321 pp.

Marx, Ludwig. — Claude Tillier als Romanschriftsteller. Diss. *Heidelberg:* D. Straus, 1916. 110 pp.

Neumann, Dorothea.—Der Artikel Genève des VII. Bandes der Encyclopädie. Diss. *Berlin:* 1917. vii + 144 pp.

Pauli, Ivan. — Contribution à l'étude du vocabulaire d'Alphonse Daudet. *Lund:* C. W. K. Gleerup, 1921. xi + 109 pp. Kr. 6.

Renault, J.—Les Idées pédagogiques de Montaigne. *Paris:* Lethielleux, 1921. 63 pp.

Ronsard.—Sonnets pour Hélène. Introd. et notes de R. Sorg. *Paris:* Bossard, 1921. 247 pp.

Suberville, Jean.—Edmond Rostand. Son théâtre. Son œuvre posthume. *Paris:* Etienne Chiron, 1921 (2 ed.). viii + 159 pp. Fr. 5.

Urfé, H. d'.—L'Astrée. Première Partie, éd. par. H. Vaganay. *Strasbourg:* Heitz. [Bibl. Romanica, nos. 257, 264.]

ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia, commentata da C. Steiner. Vol. II: Il Purgatorio. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1921. 348 pp. L. 9.

—— La Divina Commedia. Edizione senza note a cura di C. Steiner. 3 vols. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1921. 134, 140, 132 pp. L. 4.50 each.

—— La Divina Commedia con le note di N. Tommaseo e introduzione di U. Cosimo. Vol. II: Purgatorio. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1921. 442 pp. L. 15. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, IV.)

—— La Divina Commedia nella figurazione artistica e nel secolare commento a cura di G. Biagi. Fol., disp. 1ª-2ª. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1921. L. 60 each.

—— Della morte di —, per cura della Rivista di filosofia neoscolastica e della rivista Scuola Cattolica. *Milano:* Società editrice Vita e Pensiero, 1921. viii + 192 pp. Edizione comune, L. 10; edizione di lusso, L. 15.

Arensburg, W. — The Cryptography of Dante. *New York:* Knopf, 1921. 500 pp. $6.00.

Barbiera, R.—Carlo Porta e la sua Milano. *Firenze:* G. Barbèra, 1921. xi + 423 pp. L. 20. (Collezione gialla.)

Brunelli, B.—I teatri di Padova. *Padova:* A. Draghi, 1921. 548 pp. L. 45.

Canesi, Gaetano.—Interlingua (lingua internazionale) con ortografia latina. Vocabolario interlingua italiano-inglese e italiano-interlingua, con prefazione di G. Peano. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1921. 190 pp. L. 10.

Fiore, L.—La scoperta d'America e gli umanisti del Cinquecento. *Roma:* Maglione e Strini, 1921. 62 pp. L. 7.

Manzoni, A.—I Promessi Sposi. Storia milanese del secolo XVII scoperta e rifatta. Edizione speciale per il centenario (1821-1921). *Milano:* U. Hoepli, 1921. 580 pp. L. 8.50. (Biblioteca classica Hoepliana.)

—— Tragedie. Introduzione e note di P. Egidi. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1921. xxxvi + 248 pp. L. 8. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, XXXVIII.)

Mastelloni Di San Nicola, Francesco.—Delle voci degli animali nei verbi della lingua italiana e della latina. Manuale. *Roma:* Maglione e Strini, 1921. 69 pp. L. 4.

Monti, Vincenzo.—L'Iliade di Omero. Introduzione e note di R., D'Alfonso. Vol. I. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1921. xliv + 210 pp. L. 12. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, XLIV.)

Mortarino, G. (Mario Nort).—Esposizione sintetica della Divina Commedia, con tavole schematiche. 2a edizione migliorata. Parte I: L'Inferno. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia, 1920. 84 pp. L. 3.

Natoli, L. — Musa siciliana. Antologia della poesia dialettale sicula. *Milano:* R. e C. Caddeo, 1921. lxiv + 304 pp. L. 10.

Nosenzo, D.—Dizionarietto etimologico dei grecismi, con la pronunzia figurata delle radici. *Livorno:* R. Giusti, 1921. 159 pp. L. 4.50. (Biblioteca studenti, n. 495-497.)

Nota, A., e Fontana, P.—Pagine gaie e pagine forti ad uso delle scuole medie superiori. *Milano:* R. Sandron, 1921. 867 pp. L. 18.

Parini, G.—Le Odi. Commento di A. Ottolini. *Milano:* R. e C. Caddeo, 1921. 120 pp. L. 4. (Collezione universale, n. 41-42.)

Penco, E.—Panorami della Divina Commedia. Inferno; Purgatorio; Paradiso. Unica figurazione ed interpretazione sintetica di quanto Dante vide nel suo mistico viaggio, arricchita di molte note marginali. *Milano:* Fratelli Penco, 1921. Fol. L. 15.

Pistelli, E. — Per la Firenze di Dante. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1921. 48 pp. L. 3.50.

Tasso, Torquato. — De l'amore e de la gelosia. *Genova:* Libreria moderna (G. Ricci), 1921. 77 pp. L. 2.50. (I libri dell'amore.)

Toffanni, G.—Machiavelli e il Tacitismo. *Padova:* A. Draghi, 1921. 340 pp. L. 15.

Torraca, F.—Nuovi studi danteschi nel VI centenario della morte di Dante. *Napoli:* Federico e Ardia, 1921. viii + 532 pp. L. 18.

Toynbee, P. J. — Dante Studies. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1921. viii + 332 pp. $7.20.

SPANISH

Belmonte Bermúdez, L. de.—La Hispálica. Publicala por vez primera precedida de un estudio biográfico-crítico, don Santiago Montoto. *Sevilla:* Impr. de Sob. de Izquierdo, 1921. 4to., 324 pp.

Biblioteca Filológica de l'Institut de la Llengua Catalana. Vol. VIII. *Barcelona:* Impr. Elzeviriana, 1921. 4to., 133 pp.

———. Vol. XIII. *Barcelona:* Impr. Elzeviriana, 1921. 4to., 148 pp.

Caro, M. A. — Estudios literarios. Segunda serie. Edición oficial hecha bajo la dirección de V. E. Caso y A. Gómez Restrepo. *Bogotá:* Impr. Nacional, 1921. 4to., li + 432 pp. (Obras completas, III.)

Lafuente, F.—El romancero del Quijote. *Madrid:* "Progreso Gráfico," 1916. 4to., 170 pp.

Lemus y Rubio, P.—Manual de preceptiva literaria con notas históricas sobre las combinaciones métricas. *Murcia:* Impr. de J. Sánchez, 1921. 214 pp.

López Barrera, J. — Estudios literarios. Crítica de traducciones en prosa y en verso. *Málaga:* Tip. Zambrana, 1921. 186 pp.

Madariaga, S. de.—Shelley and Calderón, and Other Essays in English and Spanish Poetry. *New York:* Dutton, 1921. 198 pp. $6.00.

Maristany, F.—Las cien mejores poesías españolas líricas. Prefacio y selección de —. *Barcelona:* 1921. 200 pp.

Méndez Bejarano, M.—Vida y obras de don José Ma. Blanco y Crespo (Blanco-White). Obra premiada por la Real Academia Española. *Madrid:* Impr. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1921. 4to., 605 pp.

Mesa Ortiz, R. M.—Colombianos ilustres. Estudios y biografías. Con carta prólogo de J. Calcaño y juicio crítico de A. Andrade Coello. Tomo III. *Bogotá:* Impr. de San Bernardo, 1919. 4to., xxii + 421 pp.

Monner Sans, R.—¿Cuestión gramatical o paremiológica? *Buenos Aires:* Schenone Hnos. y Linari, 1921. 4to., 7 pp.

Moratín, L. F. de.—El Viejo y la Niña. Edited by L. B. Walton. *New York:* Longmans, Green, 1921. 113 pp. $1.10.

Revilla, M. G.—Provincialismos de expresión en México. *México:* Tip Económica, 1910. 4to., 14 pp.

Roiç de Corella, J.—Clásicos valencianos. Parlament de casa Mercader i Tragedia de Caldesa. Novelas. Siglo XV. Publicadas con unos estudios literarios por S. Guinot. *Castellón:* Hijos de J. Armengot, 1921. 187 pp.

Suárez, C. — Ideas. Autores y libros. Ecos del 98. España y el desastre europeo. Espejismos políticos y sociales. Cosas hispanoamericanas. Disquisiciones entretenidas. *Barcelona:* B. Bauza, 1921. 295 pp.

—— Vocabulario cubano. Suplemento a la 14ª ed. del Diccionario de la R. A. de la Lengua. *Barcelona:* Impr. Clarasc, 1921. xxx + 578 pp.

Yorkshire Dialect. — A Little Book of Yorkshire Dialect. Or original tales and verses in dialect, by members of the Yorkshire Dialect Society. *York:* T. A. J. Waddington, 1921. 1sh. 6d.

GERMAN

Bach, Adolf.—Die Schärfung in der moselfränkischen Mundart von Arzbach. Diss. *Giessen:* 1921. 25 pp.

Bock, Werner.—Die ästhetischen Anschauungen Wielands. *Berlin:* 1921, Fleischel & Co. 123 pp.

Bode, Wilh.—Goethes Schweizer Reisen. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1922. viii + 288 pp. Bound, M. 60. + 30%.

Bürger, G. A., und Philippine Gatterer. Ein Briefwechsel aus Göttingens empfindsamer Zeit. Hrsg. v. E. Ebstein. *Leipzig:* Dieterich, 1921. 221 pp., 8 plates. M. 28.

Fischer, Paul.—Goethes Altersweisheit. *Tübingen:* Mohr, 1921. xii + 248 pp. Bound, M. 50.

Freyhan, Max.—Das Drama der Gegenwart. *Berlin:* E. S. Mittler & Sohn, 1922. viii + 120 pp. M. 17.50.

Garbe, Ulrike. — Beiträge zur Ethik der Sturm- und Drang-Dichtung. Diss. Leipzig. *Weida:* 1916. 124 pp.

Hainrich, P. — Werther und René. [Romanisches Museum, H. 18]. *Greifswald:* Bruncken & Co., 1921. 81 pp. M. 12.50.

Hammerich, Louis L.—Zur deutschen Akzentuation [Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk- filologiske Meddedelser VII, 1]. *Kopenhagen:* Andr. Fred. Høst & Søn, 1921. 330 pp.

Heygrodt, R. H.—Die Lyrik Rainer Maria Rilkes. Versuch einer Entwicklungsgeschichte. *Freiburg i. B.:* J. Bielefeld, 1921. 151 pp. M. 25.

Jahrbuch der Sammlung Kippenberg. Bd. 1. Mit 6 Bildertafeln. *Leipzig:* Insel-Verlag [1921]. 332 pp. Cloth, M. 35.

Jörss, Lisbeth.—Das Arnsteiner Marienge bet und die Sequenzen des Mittelalters. Diss. *Marburg:* 1919. 98 pp.

Kaulfuss-Diesch, K. — Deutsche Dichtung im Strome deutschen Lebens. Eine Literaturgeschichte. *Leipzig:* R. Voigtländer [1921]. xi + 316 pp. Cloth, M. 40.

Kock, Ernst A.—Kontinentalgermanische Streifzüge [Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N. F. Avd. 1. Bd. 15. Nr. 3.]. *Lund:* C. W. K. Gleerup. *Leipzig:* Otto Harrassowitz [1919]. 34 pp. Kr. 1.50.

Krause, Herm.—Die Geschichte der neueren zoologischen Nomenklatur in deutscher Sprache. Diss. *Göttingen:* 1918. 67 pp.

Lewalter, Ernst.—Friedrich Schlegel und sein romantischer Witz. Münchener Diss. *Leipzig:* 1917. 64 pp.

Maenner, Ludw.—Karl Gutzkow und der demokratische Gedanke. Diss. *München:* 1920. 149 pp.

Martens, Kurt.—Die deutsche Literatur unsrer Zeit. In Charakteristiken u. Proben. *München:* Rösl & Cie., 1921. 524 pp., 31 portraits, 7 facsimiles. Cloth, M. 150.

Nibelunge Not — Kudrun. — Hrsg. v. E. Sievers. *Leipzig:* Insel-Verlag, 1921. 626 pp.

Paasche, Fredrik. — Goethe. Ein Profil. Aus dem Norwegischen. Mit einem Vorwort von Friedr. Lienhard. *Stuttgart:* Greiner & Pfeiffer, 1922. iii + 77 pp. M. 10.

Pohl, Gerhard — Der Strophenbau im deutschen Volkslied. [Palaestra 136.] *Berlin:* Mayer & Müller, 1921. viii + 219 pp. M. 28.

Rachel, Joachim. — Zwei satyrische Gedichte "Der Freund" und "Der Poet" nach den Kopenhagener Hss. hrsg. von Axel Lindquist [Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N. F. Avd. 1. Bd. 16. Nr. 5.]. *Lund:* C. W. K. Gleerup; *Leipzig:* Otto Harrassowitz [1920]. xix + 37 pp. Kr. 3.

Reichel, Otto.—Der Verlag von Mohr und Zimmer in Heidelb. u. die Heidelb. Romantik. Diss. München. *Augsburg:* 1913. 114 pp.

San-Giorgiu, Jon. — Sebastian Merciers dramaturgische Ideen im "Sturm u. Drang." Diss. *Basel:* 1921. 86 pp.

Schiller, Friedrich v. — Der Geisterseher, hrsg. v. R. A. Cotton. *Oxford:* Universitätsverlag, 1920. 93 pp.

Sommerfeld, M. — Friedrich Nicolai und der Sturm und Drang. Diss. München. *Leipzig:* 1917. xiii + 71 pp.

Spiero, Heinrich.—Julius Rodenberg. Sein Leben und seine Werke. *Berlin:* Gebr. Paetel, 1921. 144 pp. M. 20.

Tannhäuser, Der.—Herausgegeben von S. Singer. *Tübingen:* J. C. B. Mohr, 1922. 47 pp. M. 15.

Walter, Karl. — Justinus u. Theobald Kerners Beziehungen zum Elsass. *Ludwigsburg:* C. F. Schulz, 1921. 51 pp. M. 5.

Wien, A.—Die Seele der Zeit in der Dichtung um die Jahrhundertwende. *Leipzig:* R. Voigtländer [1921]. 327 pp. Bound, M. 40.

Witkop, Philipp.—Heinrich von Kleist. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1922. 276 pp. M. 45.50.

Wolff, M. L. — Geschichte der Romantheorie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der deutschen Verhältnisse. *Nürnberg:* Koch, 1915. xv + 96 pp.

Zademack, Franz.—Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg. Richard Wagners Dichtung u. ihre Quellen. Hrsg. von —. [Der Domschatz, Bd. 5]. *Berlin:* Dom-Verlag, 1921. 336 pp. Cloth, M. 45.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Baltensberger, Herman.—Eid, Versprechen und Treuschwur bei den Angelsachsen. Diss. *Zürich:* 1920.

Behrend, Mathilde. — Die mittelenglische 'Tale of Beryn.' Diss. *Königsberg:* 1922.

Beschorner, Franz. — Verbale Reime bei Chaucer. Diss. *Göttingen:* 1920.

Björkmann, Erik.—Studien über die Eigennamen im Beowulf. [Studien zur englischen Philologie, 58.] *Halle:* Max Niemeyer, 1920.

Bognitz, Alfred.—Doppeltsteigende Alliterationsverse im Angelsächs. Diss. *Berlin:* 1920.

Brink, August.—Stab und Wort im Gawain. Diss. *Göttingen:* 1920.

Child, Frederic Anthony.—The Life and Collected Poems of Thomas Flatman. Dissertation. *Philadelphia:* University of Pennsylvania, 1922.

Dutt, S. — Shakespeare's Macbeth: An Oriental Study. 107 pp. *Calcutta:* M. Bose & Co., 1921.

Edgar, Henry C.—A Minimum Course in Rhetoric. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922. $1.50.

Ekwall, Eilert.—Scandinavians and Celts in North-West England. [Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, XIV, no. 27.] *Leipzig:* Otto Harrassowitz, 1918.

Gepp, Edward. — A Contribution to an Essex Dialect Dictionary. *London:* G. Routledge & Sons, 1920.

Gollancz, Sir Israel.—Pearl: An English Poem of the XIVth Century. Edited with Modern Rendering, together with Boccaccio's Olympia. *London:* Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press, 1921. lii + 285 pp.

Grossmann, Rudolf. — Spanien und das elizabethanische Drama. Diss. *Leipzig:* 1920.

Hanstein, Marg.—Die franz. Literatur im Urteil der engl. Romantiker Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey. Diss. *Halle:* 1921.

Hubbard, Lucius L.—The Narrative of the El-Ho, Sjouke Gabbes: An Episode from the Mighty Kingdom of Krinke Kesmes, by Hendrik Smeeks. Translated from the Dutch and compared with the Story of Robinson Crusoe. *Ann Arbor:* George Wahr, 1922.

Huscher, Herb. — Studien zu Shelleys Lyrik. Diss. *Leipzig:* 1920.

Imelmann, R.—Forschungen zur altengl. Poesie. *Berlin:* Weidmann, 1921.

John, Johanna. — Die mittelengl. Spielmannsballade von Simon Frazer. *Bonn:* Peter Hanstein, 1921.

Jente, Richard.—Die mythologischen Ausdrücke im altenglischen Wortschatz. Eine kulturgeschichtlich-etymologische Untersuchung. [Anglistische Forsuchungen, Heft 56.] *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1921.

Kalhühler, Florine.—Die Natur des Spleens bei den englischen Schriftstellern in der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts. Diss. *Münster:* 1922.

Korten, Hertha. — Thomas Hardy's Napoleondichtung 'The Dynasts.' Ihre Abhängigkeit von Schopenhauer; ihr Einfluss auf Gerhart Hauptmann. Diss. *Rostock:* 1919.

Law, Ernest. — Shakespeare's 'Tempest' as originally produced at Court. *London:* Chatto & Windus, 1921. 1sh. 6d.

Luick, Karl.—Historische Grammatik der engl. Sprache. 5. Lfg. *Leipzig:* Chr. H. Tauchnitz, 1921. M. 6.

Maghee, Francis C.—Rhythmic Phonetic Training. *Boston:* The Stratford Co., 1922. $2.50.

Manly, John M. and Rickert, Edith.—Contemporary British Literature. Bibliographies and Study Outlines. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922. 196 pp.

de Moduriaga, Salvador. — Shelley and Calderon, and Other Essays on English and Spanish Poetry. *London:* Constable & Co., 1921. 15sh.

Murray, Gilbert.—Tradition and Progress. *Boston:* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1921. $3.00.

—— Lord Byron's Correspondence, chiefly with Lady Melbourne, Mr. Hobhouse, the Hon. Douglas Kinnard, and P. B. Shelley. Edited, in 2 vols. *London:* John Murray, 1922. 25sh.

Norwood, Gilbert.—Euripides and Shaw, with Other Essays. *London:* Methuen & Co., 1921. 226 pp.

Sägesser, Arthur.—John Hoole, his Life and his Tragedies. Diss. *Bern:* 1920.

Schaubert, Else. — Draytons Anteil an Henry VI, 2 und 3. Diss. *Breslau:* 1920.

Schwartz, Marie. — Alliteration im englischen Kulturleben neuerer Zeit. Diss. *Greifswald:* 1922.

Shelly, Percy Van Dyke. — English and French in England, 1066-1100. Dissertation. *Philadelphia:* University of Pennsylvania, 1922.

Siebold, Erika.—Betrachtung der Synästhesien bei den engl. Dichtern Diss. *Heidelberg:* 1918.

Uhl, Willis Lemon.—Scientific Determination of the Content of the Elementary School Course in Reading. [University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History, No. 4.] *Madison:* University of Wisconsin, 1921.

Weinmann, Paul. — Ueber den Gebrauch des Artikels im Ormulum. Diss. *Kiel:* 1920.

GERMAN

Arnim, Bettina v. — Sämtliche Werke. Hrsg. mit Benutzung ungedruckten Materials von W. Oehlke. 9 Bde. *Berlin:* Propyläen-Verlag, 1920-1921.

Bab, Julius.—Fortinbras oder der Kampf des 19. Jhs. mit dem Geiste der Romantik. 6 Reden. 2. Aufl. *Berlin:* Oesterheld & Co., 1921. 264 pp. M. 26.

Braun, Hanns.—Grillparzers Verhältnis zu Shakespeare. Diss. München. *Nürnberg:* Lotter, 1916. viii + 115 pp.

Brentano, Klemens, u. Minna Reichenbach. Ungedruckte Briefe des Dichters. Hrsg. von W. Limburger. *Leipzig:* Insel-Verlag, 1921. 86 pp. M. 45.

Ebner-Eschenbach, Marie v. — Sämtliche Werke. 6 Bde. *Berlin:* Gebr. Paetel [1920]. Boards, M. 180.

Hölderlin, J. C. F.—Neuaufgefundene Jugendarbeiten. Mitgeteilt von W. Betzendörfer u. Th. Haering d. J. *Nürnberg:* Verlag "Der Bund," 1921. 69 pp., Bound, M. 55.

Kiesgen, Laurenz.—Heinrich von Kleist. 2. Aufl. [Dichter-Biographien. Bd. 6. Universal-Bibl. Nr. 4218-19.] *Leipzig:* Ph. Reclam jun. [1921]. 133 pp. M. 5.

Klettenberg, Susanne v.—Neue Lieder. 1765. Faksimile Neudruck, nach dem in der Stadtbibl. zu Frankfurt a. M. aufgefundenen Handexemplar der Dichterin hrsg. v. Emil Sarnow. *Frankfurt a. M.:* Frankfurter Verlagsanstalt [1921]. 16 + 7 pp. Boards, M. 40.

Kutscher, A. — Frank Wedekind. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Bd. 1. *München:* Georg Müller, 1922. 423 pp. Cloth, M. 80.

Lessing, O. E.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in ihren Grundzügen. *Dresden:* C. Reissner, 1921. 345 pp. 4°. M. 60.

Morant und Galie, nach der Cölner Hs. hrsg. v. Erich Kalisch [Rheinische Beiträge und Hülfsbücher zur german. Philologie u. Volkskunde. 2. Bd.]. *Bonn:* K. Schroeder, 1921. xix + 167 pp. M. 17.

Platen, A. v. — Der Briefwechsel des Grafen August von Platen. Hrsg. v. Paul Bornstein. 3. Bd. *München:* Georg Müller, 1921. 332 pp. M. 104.

Schröder, F. R.—Nibelungenstudien [Rhein. Beitr. u. Hülfsbücher, Bd. VI.]. *Bonn:* Kurt Schröder, 1921. 58 pp. M. 15.

Stübiger, Kurt.—Untersuchungen zu Gundacker von Judenburg. [Germanische Studien, H. 15.] *Berlin:* E. Ebering, 1922. xv + 169 pp. M. 48.

Wien, A.—Die Seele der Zeit in der Dichtung um die Jahrhundertwende. *Leipzig:* R. Voigtländer [1921]. 327 pp. Bound, M. 40.

FRENCH

Boisrobert.—Epistres en vers. Ed. crit. par M. Cauchie. T. 1. *Paris:* Hachette, 1921. xiii + 301 pp. Fr. 16. [Soc. des textes fr. mod.]

Bordeaux, H.—La Peur de vivre, ed. with introd., notes, and vocab. by H. W. Church. *New York:* Henry Holt, 1922. xxv + 276 pp.

Beaunier, A.—La Jeunesse de Mme de la Fayette. *Paris:* Flammarion, 1921. Fr. 7.

Bozon, Nicole.—Le proverbes de bon enseignement, pub. par A. Chr. Thorn. *Lund:* C. W. K. Gleerup, 1921. xxxi + 65 pp. Kr. 5.

Braunschvig, M.—Notre literature étudiée dans les textes. II. Le XVIIe et le XIXe siècle. *Paris:* Armand Colin, 1921. 844 pp. Fr. 16.80.

Foerster, W., und Koschwitz, E.—Altfrz. Uebungsbuch. 6 Aufl. besorgt von Alfons Hilka. *Leipzig:* Reisland, 1921. vi pp. + 326 col. M. 15, bound, M. 20.

Loesch, Georg. — Die impressionistische Syntax der Goncourt. (Eine syntaktisch-stilistische Untersuchung). Diss. *Nürnberg:* Hilz, 1919. 124 pp.

Lot-Borodine, Myrrha.—Trois essais sur le roman de Lancelot du Lac et la Quête du Saint Graal. *Paris:* Champion, 1919. 127 pp.

Marie de France.—Les Lais. 1-4. Intr. par Ernst Hoepffner. (Bibliotheca Romanica. 274. 275.) *Strasbourg:* J. H. E. Heitz, 1921. xxiii + 107 pp. M. 6.

Mazzola, F.—La pedagogia d'Helvetius. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1921. 174 pp. L. 7.

Milhaud, G.—Descartes savant. *Paris:* Soc. fr. d'imprimerie, 1921. 252 pp. Fr. 12.50.

Nesselstrauss, B.—Flauberts Briefe (1871-80). Versuch einer Chronologie. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1922. 64 pp.

Perrichon, J. E.—Sainte-Beuve. Madame de Pontivy. Christel. *Paris:* Soc. litt. de France, 1920. 155 pp.

Pierrehumbert, W. — Dictionnaire historique du parler neufchâtelois et suisse romand. (To be published in ca. 15 pts.) *Neufchâtel:* Attinger frères, 1921 ff.

Purgatoire de Saint Patrice, le.—Pub. par Marianne Mörner. *Lund:* C. W. K. Gleerup, 1920. xxvii + 62 pp. Kr. 4.50.

Rousseau, J.-J.—Vie et Œuvres, avec des notes explicatives par A. Schinz. *Boston:* D. C. Heath, 1921. xi + 382 pp.

Schurter, Hans.—Die Ausdrücke für den "Löwenzahn" im Galloromanischen. Mit. 1. Karte. (Sprachgeographische Arbeiten, H. 2). *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1921. ix + 131 pp. M. 14.

Schwan, E., und Behrens, D.—Grammatik des Altfranzösischen. 3. Materialien zur Einführung in das Studium der altfranz. Mundarten. 3 Aufl. *Leipzig:* Reisland, 1921. viii + 147 pp. M. 8, kart. M. 12.

Stephan, G. — Die Bezeichnungen der Weide im Galloromanischen. (Giessener Beitr. z. Rom. Phil., V.). *Giessen:* 1921. M. 13.

Taube, N. E. — Etude sur l'emploi de l'argot des malfaiteurs chez les auteurs romantiques. Diss. *Uppsala:* Appelberg, 1917. xxxii + 99 pp.

Tieghem, P. van.—La Poésie de la nuit et des tombeaux en Europe au XVIIIe siècle. *Paris:* F. Rieder, 1921. 177 pp.

Vermale, Fr.—Notes sur Joseph de Maistre inconnu. *Chambéry:* Dardel, 1921. 131 pp.

Villon, Fr.—Œuvres. Texte établi par A. Longnon, revu et publ. par L. Foulet. *Paris:* Crès, 1919. xiii + 221 pp. Fr. 12.

Villon, François.—Les ballades en jargon du ms. de Stockholm. Essai de restitution et d'interpretation . . . par le Dr. René-F. Guillon, publ. p. les soins de K. Sneyders de Vogel. *Groningen:* Wolters, 1920. 60 pp.

Vossler, Karl. — Frankreichs Kultur im Spiegel seiner Sprachentwicklung. Drittes Tausend, vermehrt durch Nachwort, Nachträge, Berichtigungen u. Index. (Samm. rom. Elem.-u. Handb., IV, 1.) *Heidelberg:* Winter, 1921. viii + 431 pp., $2.

ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia, col commento di Pietro Fraticelli. Nuova edizione, riveduta da un letterato toscano. Cenni storici intorno al poeta, nuova concordanza speciale invece di rimario, compilata da L. Polacco, indice dei nomi e delle cose, sommario del poema. *Firenze:* G. Barbèra, 1920. 623 + cxlxix pp. L. 15.

—— La Vita Nuova e il Canzoniere. Per cura di M. Scherillo. 3a ed. accresciuta. *Milano:* Hoepli, 1920. 487 pp. L. 25.

Bertacchi, G. — Il primo romanticismo lombardo. Lezioni di letteratura italiana tenute nell' anno accademico 1919-1920. Fasc. 1-9. *Padova:* G. Parisotto, 1920. 576 pp. (R. Università di Padova, Associazione fra studenti di lettere e filosofia.)

Bertoni, G.—Guarino da Verona fra letterati e cortigiani (1420-1460). *Firenze:* L. S. Olschki, 1921. xi + 216 pp. L. 50. (Biblioteca dell' Archivum Romanicum, serie I, 1.)

Campari, A.—La poesia georgica di Giovanni Pascoli. Studio critico. *Bologna:* Coop. tip. Mareggiani, 1920. 70 pp.

Eandi, M.—La vita e l'opera letteraria di Costantino Nigra. *Mondovì:* Tip. Fracchia, 1920. 30 pp.

Fioroni, M. — Preludi d'arte manzoniana nel seicento. Saggio di commenti ai Promessi Sposi e alle opere minori di A. Manzoni. *Spoleto:* Unione tipografica, 1920. 41 pp. L. 2.50.

Fuà, F.—Don Giovanni attraverso le letterature italiana e spagnuola. *Torino:* Lattes, 1920. 200 pp. L. 10.

Goldoni, C.—La vedova scaltra. *Strassburg:* J. H. E. Heitz, 1920. xvi + 84 pp. M. 3 + 100%. (Bibliotheca romanica, 260-261.)

Haese, Hubertine.—Die Syntax des Fra Guittone von Arezzo nach seinen Briefen. Auszug. *Bonn:* 1920. (Bonn Dissertation.)

Hebeisen, W.—Die Bezeichnungen für Geschirr, Eimer, Krug im Französischen, Oberitalienischen und Rätoromanischen. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Alpengebietes. *Bern:* 1920. 68 pp. (Bern Dissertation.)

Melillo, G. — Il dialetto di Volturino (Foggia). *Perugia:* Unione tipografica cooperativa, 1920. 83 pp.

Merlo, C.—Fonologia del dialetto di Sora. *Pisa:* C. F. Mariotti, 1920. 167 pp. (Repr. fr. the Annali delle Università Toscane, 1919, n. serie, vol. IV, fasc. V.)

Navarra, Teresa.—Un oscuro imitatore di Lope de Vega: Carlo Celano. Un documento della fama di Lope de Vega in Italia. Contributo alle relazioni letterarie italo-spagnuole nel scolo XVII. *Bari:* Soc. tip. pugliese, 1919. 34 pp.

Nerone Nigrelli, Clelia.—Il conte Oldrado Del Balzo nel romanzo "Marco Visconti" di T. Grossi. *Catania:* Tip. La Rinascente, 1919. 14 pp.

Ottolini, A.—Giovanni Prati. *Messina:* G. Principato, 1919. 92 pp. L. 2. (Storia critica della letteratura italiana.)

Palleschi, F.—Patria, politica, e società delle nazioni nel pensiero e nell' opera di Dante. *Parma:* 1920. L. 2.50.

Pellegrini, G.—L'umanista Bernardo Rucellai e le sue opere storiche. *Livorno:* R. Giusti, 1920. 72 pp. L. 5.

Reitano, S.— La poesia in Sicilia nel secolo XVIII. *Palermo:* Sandron, 1920. 351 pp. L. 12.

Ruggenini, A. — Studio psicologico sull'ode "Alle fonti del Clitunno" di G. Carducci. *Napoli:* P. Federico e G. Ardia, 1920. 73 pp. L. 1.

Scardovi, P.—L'abate Parini e il "dolce pericolo." Fra le quinte della storia letteraria. *Bologna:* Cappelli, 1919. 62 pp.

Turri, V. — L'Italia nel libro di Dante. Conferenza pronunziata nella casa di Dante in Roma. *Firenze:* G. C. Sansoni, 1920. 32 pp. L. 2.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Zacchetti, C.—Lord Byron e l'Italia. *Palermo:* Sandron, 1920. viii + 118 pp.

SPANISH

Arco, R. del.—Misterios, autos sacramentales y otras fiestas en la catedral de Huesca. *Madrid:* 1920. 16 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos.")

Calvo Revilla, L. — Actores célebres del teatro del Príncipe o Español. Siglo XIX. Manera de representar de cada actor. Anécdotas y datos biográficos. *Madrid:* Impr. Municipal, 1920. 272 pp.

Cid.—Cantar de Mio —. *Berlin:* Weidmann, 1920. iv + 121 pp. M. 8. (Romanische Texte, 4.)

Contreras, F. — Les écrivains contemporains de l'Amérique espagnole. *Paris:* La Renaissance du livre, 1920. Fr. 4.

D'Amico, A.—L'imitazione ariostesca ne La Hermosura de Angélica di Lope de Vega. *Pistoia:* A. Pacinotti e C., 1921. 30 pp.

Gallego y Burín, A. — Ganivet. Lectura dada en el Centro Artístico de Granada el 22 de marzo de 1921. *Granada:* P. Ventura Traveset, 1921. 45 pp.

Ganivet, A. — Spaniens Weltanschauung und Weltstellung. *München:* Georg Müller, 1921. 156 pp.

Lenz, R.—Un grupo de consejas chilenas. Estudio de novelistica comparada, precedido de una introducción referente al orîjen i la propagación de los cuentos populares. *Santiago de Chile:* Imprenta de Cervantes, 1920. 152 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Revista de folklore chileno," III.)

Marqués Merchán, J. — Don Bartolomé José Gallardo. Noticia de su vida y escritos. *Málaga:* Tip. Zambana, 1921. 430 pp.

Pitollet, C. — V. Blasco Ibáñez. Ses romans et le roman de sa vie. *Paris:* Calmann-Lévy, 1921. 328 pp. Fr. 8.

Puyol y Alonso, J.—Las crónicas anónimas de Sahagún. Nueva edición conforme a un ms. del siglo XVI, precedida de un estudio crítico por don —. *Madrid:* Fortanet, 1920. 4to., 156 pp.

Rojas, R.—La literatura argentina. Ensayo filosófico sobre la evolución de la cultura en la Plata. T. III: Los proscriptos. *Buenos Aires:* Impr. "Coni," 1920. viii + 680 pp.

Semana cervantina. Resúmenes y artículos. Serie primera. Volumen I. *Castellón:* Hijos de J. Armengol, 1920. 232 pp. (Publicaciones de la Biblioteca escolar del Instituto de Castellón.)

Tirso de Molina, G. Tellez.—Comedia de Burlador de Sevilla, y convidado de piedra. *Strassburg:* J. H. E. Heitz, 1921. v + 106 pp. (Bibliotheca romanica, 272-273.)

Viada y Lluch, C.—De la limpieza, fijeza y esplendor de la lengua castellana en el Diccionario de la Real Academia Española. Discurso leído en la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona en la recepción de don — el 5 de mayo de 1921. *Barcelona:* Impr. de "La Renaixensa," 1921. 4to., 95 pp.

PROVENÇAL

Anglade, J.— Grammaire de l'ancien provençal. *Paris:* Klincksieck, 1921. xxxvii + 448 pp.

Crescini, V.—Ancora della "rotrouence" di Gaucelm Faidit. *Padova:* Fratelli Drucker, 1921. L. 2.

Levy, Emil. — Prov. Supplementwörterbuch. Fortges. v. C. Appel. 37 Heft. *Toler-Trąsfoguier. Leipzig:* Reisland, 1921.

Porschke, Alfons. — Laut- und Formenlehre des Cartulaire de Limoges, verglichen mit der Sprache der Übersetzung des Johannesevangeliums. (Ein Beitrag zum Studium des limousinischen Dialekts.) *Breslau:* Förster, 1912. 55 pp.

RHAETO-ROMANCE

Annales della Societa retoromantscha. Annada 35. *Chur:* Keller (1921). iii + 242 pp. 7 fr.

Regesten von Vorarlberg und Lichtenstein bis zum Jahre 1200.—1. Lieferung bis 1000 u. 1. Exkurs. Bearbeitet von Dr. A. Helbock mit einem sprachwissenschaftlichen Exkurs v. Dr. R. v. Planta. *Bern:* K. J. Wyss Erben, 1920. 108 + 83 pp.

ROUMANIAN

Cancel, P. — Asupra temelor vechi slave bisericesti in *ă* si asupra nasterei slavicului *-y*. *Bucuresti:* Socec, 1921. 40 pp.

—— Despre "Rumân" si despre unele probleme lexicale vechi slavo-romane. *Bucuresti:* Socec, 1921. 97 pp. 7 lei.

—— Termenii slavi de plug in Daco-Romana. *Bucuresti:* Socec, 1921. 59 pp. 6 lei.

Jordan, J.—Diftongarea luĭ e si o accentuaţĭ în poziţiile ă, e. *Iasi:* Viaţa romîneasca, 1921. 352 pp., 28 lei.

Puscariu, S. und Herzog, E. — Lehrbuch der rumänischen Sprache. 1. Anfangsgründe. 2., verb. u. verm. Aufl. *Czernowitz:* "Glascul Bucovinei," 1920. viii + 156 pp. M. 12.

GENERAL

Russell, Bertram.—Mysticism and Logic, and Other Essays. *London and New York:* Longmans, Green & Co., 1921. 9sh.

Gerdau, Hans. — Der Kampf ums Dasein im Leben der Sprache. Ein sprachbiologischer Versuch zur Lösung des Lautwandelproblems auf Darwinist. Grundlage. *Hamburg:* Gente, 1921. 62 pp. M. 3.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Bennett, Arnold.—The Love Match. A play in five scenes. *London:* Chatto & Windus, 1922. 5 sh.

Brandl, Alois.—Shakespeare. Leben—Umwelt—Kunst. *Berlin:* Ernst Hofmann & Co., 1922. xvi, 517 pp.

Christie, Mabel E.—Henry VI. *London:* Constable & Co., 1922. 16 sh.

de Coster, Charles.—The Legend of Ulenspiegel and Lamme Goedzak. A new edition, translated by F. M. Atkinson, 2 vols. *New York:* Doubleday, Page & Co., 1922. $5.00.

Dupré, Henri. — Un Italien D'Angleterre, Le Poete-Paintre, Dante Gabriel Rossetti. Préface du Professeur Legouis. *Paris:* J. M. Dent et Fils, 1922.

Fisher, Henry W. — Abroad with Mark Twain and Eugene Field. *New York:* Nicholas L. Brown, 1922. $2.25.

Fitzpatrick, Benedict. — Ireland and The Making of Britain. *New York:* Funk & Wagnalls, 1922.

Hyamson, A. M.—A Dictionary of English Phrases. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1922.

Johnson, James Weldon. — The Book of American Negro Poetry. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922.

Leo, Brother.—Teaching the Drama and the Essay. *New York:* Schwartz, Kirwin & Fauss, 1922.

Lewisohn, Ludwig.—The Drama and the Stage. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922.

Lucas, F. L. — Seneca and Elizabethan Tragedy. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1922. 7 sh. 6 d.

Lynch, Bohun. — Max Beerbohm in Perspective. *New York:* Alfred Knopf, 1922. $3.50.

McClorey, John A. — An Estimate of Shakespeare. *New York:* Schwartz, Kirwin & Fauss, 1922.

Morel, Auguste.—Francis Thompson: Le Lévrier du Ciel, etc. Traduits. *Paris:* La Maison des Amis des Livres, 1922.

Murray, John.—Lord Byron's Correspondence. 2 vols. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922.

Prescott, Frederick Clarke. — The Poetic Mind. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1922.

Saintsbury, George.—A Letter Book. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922.

Starr, Meredith. — The Future of the Novel. *New York:* Small, Maynard & Co., 1921.

Thaler, Alwin. — Shakspere to Sheridan. A Book about the Theatre of Yesterday and To-Day. *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press, 1922.

Tinker, Chauncey Brewster.—Young Boswell: Chapters on James Boswell, the Biographer, based largely on new material. *Boston:* The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1922. $3.50.

Watts-Dunton, Clara.—The Home Life of Swinburne. *London:* A. M. Philpot, 1922. 15 sh.

White, Henry Adelbert. — English Study and English Writing. *Boston:* D. C. Heath & Co., 1922.

Whitty, J. H.—The Complete Poems of Edgar Allan Poe. *London:* Constable & Co., 1922. 7 sh. 6 d.

GERMAN

Altrichter, Anton.—Heimatbuch der Iglauer Sprachinsel. Geschichte des Bodens u. der Bevölkerung. *Iglau:* Rippel & Sohn, 1921. M. 24.

Arzneibuch, Das Gothaer mittelniederdeutsche, und seine Sippe. Hrsg. v. Sven Norrbom [Mndd. Arzneibücher, hrsg. v. C. Borchling, 1. Bd.]. *Hamburg:* 1921. 240 pp.

Benndorf, Paul. — Zwei vergessene Leipziger Goethestätten. Das ehem. Hahnemannsche Gut u. d. Grosse Kuchengarten. Ein Beitr. zur Stadtgeschichte u. Goetheforschung. Mit 8 Orig.-Abb. *Leipzig:* Haessel, 1922. 48 pp. M. 6.50.

Berendsohn, W. A.—Goethes Knabendichtung. *Hamburg:* W. Gente, 1922. 172 pp. M. 35.

—— Grundformen volkstümlicher Erzählerkunst in den Kinder- u. Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm. Ein stilkritischer Versuch. *Hamburg:* W. Gente, 1921. 143 pp. M. 30.

Euphorion. Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte, hrsg. von Josef Nadler u. August Sauer. 23 Bd., 4. Hft. *Leipzig und Wien:* Carl Fromme, 1921. Pp. xii, 573-776.

—— Vierzehntes Ergänzungsheft (Gundolf-Heft). 1921, iv + 143 pp.

Götze, Alfred.—Proben hoch- und niederdeutscher Mundarten [Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen u. Übungen, 145. Hft.]. *Bonn:* Marcus & Weber, 1921. 110 pp.

[Gontard, Susette].—Die Biefe der Diotima. Veröffentlicht von Frida Arnold. Hrsg. von Carl Viëtor. *Leipzig:* Insel-Verlag, 1921. 77 pp. Bound, M. 16.—

Gross, J.—Biographisch-literarisches Lexikon der deutschen Dichter und Schriftsteller vom 9. bis zum 20. Jahrh. *Leipzig:* Hillmann, 1922. 287 pp. Bound, M. 45.

Haller, P.—Pestalozzis Dichtung. *Zürich:* Orell Füssli, 1921. 142 pp. M. 12.

Iwand, Käthe. — Die Schlüsse der mhd. Epen. [Germanische Studien, H. 16.] *Berlin:* Ebering, 1922. 171 pp. M. 48.

Keller, Gottfried, u. Widmann, J. V.— Briefwechsel. Hrsg. u. erläutert von Max Widmann. *Basel u. Leipzig:* Rhein-Verlag, 1922. 176 pp. M. 20.

—— in seinen Briefen. Hrsg. u. eingel. v. H. Amelung. *Berlin:* Bong & Co., 1921. 275 pp. Cloth, M. 35.

Kretschmer, Paul. — Wortgeographie der hochdeutschen Umgangssprache. *Göttingen:* Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1918. xvi + 638 pp.

Kricker, Gottfried.—Theodor Fontane. Der Mensch, der Dichter und sein Werk. *Berlin-Halensee:* A. Stein. 1921. 72 pp. M. 6.

Lichtenbergs Briefe an J. F. Blumenbach. Hrsg. v. A. Leitzmann. *Leipzig:* Dietrich, 1921. iii + 136 pp. M. 20.

Müller, A.—Bismarck, Nietzsche, Scheffel, Mörike. Der Einfluss nervöser Zustände auf ihr Leben u. Schaffen. Vier Krankheitsgeschichten. *Bonn:* Marcus & Weber, 1921. viii + 102 pp. M. 19.

Muller, J. W. — Critische Commentar op Van den vos Reinaerde naa de thans bekende handschriften en bewerkingen uitgegeven. *Utrecht:* Oosthoek, 1921. 367 pp.

Reutercrona, Hans.—Svarabhakti und Erleichterungsvokal im Altdeutschen bis ca. 1250. Uppsala Diss. *Heidelberg:* Winter, 1920. xxxiii + 197 pp.

Sang, Karl.—Die appellative Verwendung von Eigennamen bei Luther [Giessener Beiträge 2.]. *Giessen:* v. Münchow, 1921. viii + 69 pp. M. 15.

Schneider, Ferd. J. — Victor Hadwiger (1878-1911). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Expressionismus in der deutschen Dichtung der Gegenwart. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1921. iv + 55 pp. M. 8.

Schulze, Berthold.—Marksteine der Entwickelung neudeutscher Dichtung. 1. *Dresden:* L. Ehlermann, 1922. 72 pp. M. 6.80.

Viëtor, W.—Deutsches Aussprachewörterbuch. 3., durchges. Aufl. bes. v. E. A. Meyer. *Leipzig:* O. R. Reisland, 1921. xxii + 469 pp. M. 40.

Weber, Gottfried. — Herder und das Drama. Eine literarhist. Untersuchung [Forschungen zur neueren Lit.-gesch. 56]. *Weimar:* A. Duncker, 1922. xvi + 357 pp. M. 48.

Weber, Marta.—Fanny Lewald. Züricher Diss. *Leipzig:* Rentsch, 1921. 175 pp.

Zimmer, Herm.— Wilh. Raabes Verhältnis zu Goethe. Ein Beitrag zur Weltanschauung des Humoristen. Marburger Diss. 2. Aufl. *Görlitz:* R. Worbs & Co., 1921. vi + 74 pp. M. 9.

Zösmair, Jos. — Die Ortsnamen Vorarlbergs und Lichtensteins aus Personennamen. Ein Beitrag zur Besiedelungsgesch. dieser Gebiete. *Bregenz:* 1921. iv + 40 pp.

FRENCH

Bazin, René. — Récits du temps de la guerre. Ed. by A. Truan. *New York:* Oxford Press, 1921. 126 pp. $1.

Cario et Régismanset.—La Pensée fr. Anthologie des auteurs de maximes du XVIe s. à nos jours. *Paris:* Mercure de France, 1921. 463 pp. Fr. 12.

Casanova, J.—Mémoires. Repr. de l'éd. princeps. Commentaires par les meilleurs casanovistes. *Paris:* Champion, 1922. 12 vols. Fr. 300.

Chanson d'Aspremont, la. Tome II. Ed. par. L. Brandin. *Paris:* Champion, 1922. Fr. 10.

Chevalier, Jacques. Descartes. *Paris:* Plon-Nourrit, 1921. vii + 367 pp. Fr. 9.

Cornou, François. — Trente années de luttes contre Voltaire et les philosophes du XVIIIe siècle. Elie Fréron (1718-1776). *Paris:* Champion, 1922. 477 pp.

Esnault, G.—La vie et les œuvres comiques de Claude-Marie le Laé (1745-1791). *Paris:* Champion, 1922. 300 pp. Fr. 20.

Girard, H. — Un bourgeois dilettante à l'époque romantique, Émile Deschamps. *Paris:* Champion, 1922. 2 vols. xliv + 578 and xii + 128 pp. Fr. 50.

Hamelius, P. — Introd. à la litt. fr. et flamande de Belgique. *Bruxelles:* Office de Publicité, 1921. 316 pp. Fr. 15.

Hatzfeld, Helmut.—Einführung in die Interpretation neufranz. Texte. *München:* 1922. 115 pp. M. 150.

Histoire littéraire de la France [des Bénédictins]. T. 35. Suite du quatorzième siècle. *Paris:* Impr. nationale, 1921. xxxv + 664 pp.

Humpers, A. — Etude sur la langue de Jean Lemaire de Belges. *Paris:* Champion, 1921. 243 pp. Fr. 20.

Lamartine, A. de.— Poèmes choisis, ed. by J. L. A. Barbier. *London:* Longmans, Green & Co., 1921. lvi + 168 pp.

Lyonnet, H.—Les Premières de Molière. *Paris:* Delagrave, 1921. xii + 260 pp.

Montaigne. — Œuvres choisies disposées d'après l'ordre chronologique, avec introd., bibliographie, notes, grammaire, lexique, par R. Radouant. *Paris:* Hatier, 1921. xii + 464 pp.

Nodier, Ch.—Moi-même, ouvrage inédit. Introd. sur le roman personnel par Jean Larat. *Paris:* Champion, 1922. 70 pp. Fr. 3.

Pauphilet, A.—Etudes sur la queste del Saint Graal. *Paris:* Champion, 1922. xxxv + 207 pp. Fr. 20.

Piramus et Tisbé, poème du XIIe siècle, ed. par G. de Boer. *Paris:* Champion, 1922. xii + 55 pp. Fr. 3.

Sand, G.—La mare au diable, ed. with notes and vocab. by L. R. Gregor; ex. by R. L. Gregor. *Boston:* Ginn, 1921. xii + 162 pp. 64 cts.

Sanders, E. K.—Jacques Bénigne Bossuet; a study. *New York:* Macmillan, 1922. 408 pp. $6.

Schinz, A.—Vie et œuvres de J. J. Rousseau. *Boston:* Heath, 1921. 382 pp. $1.60.

Shears, F. — Recherches sur les prépositions dans la prose du Moyen Français (XIVe et XVe siècles). *Paris:* Champion, 1922. 233 pp. Fr. 16.

Tanquerey, E. J.—Plaintes de la Vierge en Anglo-Français. *Paris:* Champion, 1922. 180 pp. Fr. 10.

Tilley, A. A.—Molière. *New York:* Macmillan, 1921. 363 pp. $4.

Truc, Gonzague.—Le Cas Racine. *Paris:* Garnier, 1921. vi + 199 pp.

Vincent de Paul, Saint.—Correspondance, éd. par P. Coste. *Paris:* Gabalda, 1921. 655 pp.

Voretzsch, Karl. — Altfranzösisches Lesebuch zur Erläuterung der altfranzösischen Literaturgeschichte. (Sammlung kurzer Lehrbücher der rom. Sprachen u. Literaturen. 7.) *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1921. xii + 210 pp. M. 22; bound, M. 28.

SPANISH

Alberola Serra, E. — Mil y un cantares más. Prólogo de F. Rodríguez Marín. *Madrid:* Sucesores de Hernando, 1921. 251 pp. 4 pes.

Arroyo, C. — Retablo. Figuras, evocaciones, escenas. Prólogo de Gonzalo Zaldumbide. *Madrid:* G. Hernández y Galo Sáez, 1921. 221 pp.

Barros Borgoño, L.—Don Luis Rodríguez Velasco. Bosquejo biográfico. Discurso de recepción pronunciado en la Academia Chilena el 5 de junio de 1921. *Santiago de Chile:* Impr. Santiago, 1921. 41 pp.

Cáceres y Sotomayor, A.—Paráfrasis de los salmos de David. Edición e introducción del P. L. G. A. Getino. *Madrid:* Imp. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1920. lxxxvi + 404 pp. 6 pes. (Biblioteca clásica dominicana, I.)

Casanovas, I.—La Actualitat de Balmes. Discurso llegit en la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona en la recepció del P. — el 22 de maig de 1921. *Barcelona:* Impr. "Atlas Geográfico," 1921. 61 pp.

Castaneda y Alcover, V.—Los cronistas valencianos. Discursos. *Madrid:* "Revista de Archivos," 1920.

Castro Marcos, M. de.—Asturias, país de amor y tierra de fuego. Motivos literarios sobre el viaje de un sentimental por Asturias. Prólogo de A. González Blanco. *Madrid:* Impr. Helénica, 1918. 91 pp.

Domínguez Roldán, G.—Jesús Castellanos. El porvenir de la literatura. Discurso leído en el Ateneo y Círculo de la Habana ante la Academia Nacional de Artes y Letras en la recepción de — el 3 de julio de 1913. *Habana:* Est. tip. del "Avisador Comercial," 1914. 61 pp.

García Soriano, J. — Estudio acerca del habla vulgar y de la literatura de la región murciana. *Murcia:* Sanchez, 1920. 64 pp.

Gómez-Moreno, M. — Introducción a la Historia Silense, con versión castellana de la misma y de la Crónica de Sampiro, por —. *Madrid:* Sucesores de Rivadeneyra, 1921. 138 pp. (Junta para Ampliación de Estudios. Centro de Estudios Históricos.)

López Martínez, C.—Algunos documentos para la biografía de Argote de Molina, reunidos por don —. *Sevilla:* Eulogio de las Heras, 1921. 116 pp.

Monner Sans, R. — Asnología. Vocabulario y refranes. *Buenos Aires:* Impr. Coni, 1921. 4to., 96 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires," XLVI, 40.)

Montoto y Rautenstrauch, L.—Personajes, personas y personillas que corren por las tierras de ambas Castillas. Segunda impresión, aumentada y corregida. Tomo I. *Sevilla:* Tip. Gironés, 1921. 4to., 359 pp.

Puyol y Alonso, J.—El presunto cronista Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid. *Madrid:* Editorial Reus, 1920. 4to., 31 pp.

——Los cronistas de Enrique IV. *Madrid:* Editorial Reus, 1921. 4to., 78 pp.

Ruano, J. M.—Historia de la literatura. Compendio de las explicaciones dadas en su cátedra oficial por don —. 4a edición. *Badajoz:* A. Arqueros, 1917. 351 pp.

Spitzer, Leo. — Lexikalisches aus dem Katalanischen und den übrigen ibero-romanischen Sprachen. *Firenze:* L. S. Olschki, 1921. viii + 162 pp. L. 25. (Biblioteca dell' Archivum Romanicum, Serie II, 1.)

Timoneda, Juan de. — La oveja perdida. Auto sacramental de — representado en Salamanca el 9 de junio de 1920 con ocasión de la Asamblea Eucarística. Publícalo, con una introducción, notas y glosario, don A. García Baiza. *Salamanca:* M. Pérez Criado, 1921. 88 pp.

Vicente, Gil.—Auto de la Sibila Casandra conforme a la edición de 1562, con prólogo y notas de A. Giráldez. *Madrid:* Impr. Clásica Española, 1921. 47 pp.

Wilkins, L. A., and Alpern, H.—Exercise Book in Spanish. *New York:* Globe Book Co., 1921. 88 pp. 92 cts.

ITALIAN

Asioli, L.—Dante Alighieri. La sua opera, la sua fede. *Ravenna:* 1920. 98 pp. L. 2.50.

Bianchi, A. — L'apologia di Guido da Verona. *Cosenza:* "L'Avanguardia," 1920. L. 2.

Bruno, A.—Un poeta di provincia. Schiarimento catanese in difesa della poesia. *Catania:* Tip. Bodoniana, 1920. 167 pp. L. 6.

Carbonera, G.—Letterati valtellinesi del secolo XVIII. *Sondrio:* Tip. Valtellinese, 1920. 124 pp. L. 3.

Carducci, G. — Confessioni e battaglie. Serie I-II. *Napoli:* F. Bideri, 1919. 2 vols., 145, 153 pp. L. 4 each. (Collezione dei grandi autori antichi e moderni, serie 8a, 77-78.)

Carletti, E.—Poesie friulane, con prefazione di B. Chiurlo. *Udine:* Stab. tip. friulano, 1920. xvi + 142 pp. L. 4.

Cerini, M.—F. de Sanctis ed alcuni critici che lo precedettero. *Napoli:* L. Piero e Figlio, 1920. 79 pp.

Corti, Cesira.—La riforma teatrale di C. Goldoni. *Como:* Scuola tip. Casa divina Provvidenza, 1920. 109 pp.

Crispolti, F.—Minuzie manzoniane. *Napoli:* Perrella, 1920. 142 pp.

De Ritis, A.—Dante che parla. Rappresentazione storica. *Milano:* L. Trevisini, 1921. L. 3.

Flamini, F.—Poeti e critici della nuova Italia. *Napoli:* F. Perrella, 1920. 119 pp. L. 3. (Biblioteca rara: testi e documenti di letteratura, d'arte e di storia, raccolti da A. Pellizzari, 2a serie, XXXIII-XXXV).

Fletcher, J. B.—Symbolism of the Divine Comedy. *New York:* Lemcke & Buechner, 1921. viii + 245 pp. $2.00.

Foscolo, U.—Lettere amorose ad Antonietta Fagnani, pubblicate per cura di G. Mestica, con un discorso. Terza edizione. *Firenze:* G. Barbèra, 1920. xcii + 356 pp. L. 8.

Fresta, M.—Il regno di Sicilia nelle opere di Dante Alighieri. *Acireale:* Tip. Orario delle ferrovie, 1920. 177 pp. L. 8.

Leicht, P. S.—L'unità di linguaggio e di civiltà in Friuli. *Udine:* 1920. (Opuscoli della "Società filologica friulana," 3.)

Oriani, A.—Pensieri sull' amore e sulla donna. *Genova:* Libreria moderna (G. Ricci), 1921. 86 pp. L. 2.50. (I libri dell'amore.)

Padula, A.—Brunetto Latini e il "Pataffio." *Roma:* Soc. ed. Dante Alighieri, 1920. xvi + 285 pp. L. 10. (Pel VI centenario di Dante.)

Pagano, A.—Alfredo Baccelli poeta e prosatore. *Napoli:* P. Federico e G. Ardia (S. Morano), 1920. 174 pp. L. 5.

Paulucci di Calboli, R. — Il canto dell'amore dei "duo cognati." Lettura e commento del canto V dell' Inferno. *Firenze:* E. Ariani, 1920. 23 pp.

Pellegrini, L.—La prima opera di Margherita di Navarra e la terza rima in Francia. *Catania:* Battiato, 1920. 80 pp. L. 3.

Ricciardi, A.—Il teatro del colore. Conferenza tenuta nel ridotto del teatro Argentina il 17 marzo 1920. *Roma:* So poligrafica italiana, 1920. 11 pp. L. 0.25.

Righi, Lina.—Appunti sopra la lirica di Monte Andrea, rimatore fiorentino del secolo XIII. *Firenze:* Tip. Bandettini, 1920. 76 pp.

Rodocanachi, E. — Leopardi. *Paris:* La Renaissance du Livre, 1920. Fr. 3.75.

Russo, P. — Contributo di studi sulle "Grazie" del Foscolo. *Genova:* Caimo e C., 1920. 155 pp.

Scarfoglio, E.—Il libro di Don Chisciotte. Nuova ristampa della edizione A. Sommaruga, 1885. *Napoli:* F. Bideri, 1920. 2 vols., 160, 194 pp. L. 7. (Collezione dei grandi autori antichi e moderni, serie 9ª, ni 84-85.)

Strolic Furlan, Il, pal 1921 dat fûr dai amîs dal lengàz furlân cun duc' i Marciâz, lis Sagris, lis fiestis di bal e altris divertimènz. Udin An II. *Udin:* Meni Del Bianco e Fi, Stampadors, 1920. 55 pp.

GENERAL

Caullery, Maurice.—Universities and Scientific Life in the United States. *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press. $2.50.

De Wolf, Maurice.—Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages. *Princeton:* University Press, 1922. $3.00.

Egan, Rose F.—The Genesis of the Theory of "Art for Art's Sake" in Germany and in England. [Smith College Studies in Modern Languages II, 4]. *Northampton:* 1921. 61 pp.

Guérard, Albert Leon.—A Short History of the International Language Movement. *London:* Fisher Unwin, 1922. 21sh.

Hearnshaw, F. J. C. (Editor).—Mediaeval Contributions to Modern Civilization. *New York:* Henry Holt & Co., 1922.

Jakobsen, J. — Etymologisk ordbog over det norrøne sprog på Shetland. *Kopenhagen:* W. Prior, 1921. xlviii + 1032 + xviii pp.

Stanoyevich, Milivoy S.—Early Jugoslav Literature (1000-1800). *New York:* Columbia University Press, 1922. $1.75.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Alden, Raymond Macdonald. — Shakespeare. [Master Spirits of Literature.] *New York:* Duffield & Co., 1922. xix, 377 pp.

Cohen, Helen Louise. — Longer Plays by Modern Authors (American). Edited. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922.

Cook, Albert S.—The Possible Begetter of the Old English 'Beowulf' and 'Widsith.' [Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. Vol. 25, pp. 281-346.] *New Haven:* Yale University Press, 1922.

Cook, Albert S. and Pitman, James H.—The Old English Physiologus. Text and Prose Translation by A. S. Cook; Verse Translation by J. H. Pitman. 25 pp. [Yale Studies in English LXIII.] *New Haven:* Yale University Press, 1922.

Dibble, Roy F.—Albion W. Tourgée. Columbia University Dissertation. *New York:* Lemcke & Buechner, 1921.

Dunn, Waldo H.—The Life of Donald G. Mitchell (Ik Marvell). *New York:* Charles Scribners' Sons, 1922. $4.50.

English Verse.—The Le Gallienne Book of English Verse. *New York:* Boni & Liveright, 1922. $3.50.

Erasmus.—Praise of Folly. Illustrations by Holbein. *New York:* The Peter Eckler Publishing Co., 1922.

Fischer, Walther.—Die Briefe Richard Moncton Milnes', ersten Barons Houghton, an Varnhagen von Ense (1844-1854). Mit einer literarhistorischen Einleitung und Anmerkungen. [Anglistische Forschungen. Heft 57.] *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1922.

Förster, Max. — Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen. Eine sprachliche Untersuchung. [Reprinted from Texte und Forschungen zur engl. Kulturgeschichte: Festgabe für Felix Liebermann.] *Halle:* Max Niemeyer, 1921.

Handke, Adolf.—Die Mundart von Mittel-Yorkshire um 1700, nach Merton's Yorkshire Dialogue. Dissertation. *Darmstadt.*

Haney, J. L.—Good English. Revised edition. *Philadelphia:* Peter Reilly, 1922. $1.00.

Kock, Ernst A.—Plain Points and Puzzles. 60 notes on Old English Poetry. [Reprinted from Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, XVII.] *Leipzig:* Otto Harrassowitz, 1922.

Kruisinga, E.—A Handbook of Present-Day English. Vol. II: English Accidence and Syntax. Third edition. xxx, 912 pp. *Utrecht:* Kemink & Zoon, 1922.

Kruisinga, A. and Schutt, J. H.—Lessons in English Grammar. xv, 175 pp. *Utrecht:* Kemink & Zoon, 1922.

Leonard, A. W. and Fuess, C. M.—Good Writing. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922.

Lubbock, Percy. — The Craft of Fiction. *New York:* Charles Scribners' Sons, 1922. $3.00.

Orage, A. R.—Readers and Writers. *New York:* Alfred Knopf, 1922. $1.75.

Reade, Aleyn Lyell. — Johnsonian Gleanings. Part III: The Doctor's Boyhood. *London:* The Arden Press, 1922.

Shakespeare.—Measure for Measure. The Works of Shakespeare edited by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1922. 7sh.

Shakespeare.—Adaptations. Dryden's 'The Tempest'; Tate's 'King Lear'; Duffet's 'The Mock Tempest.' *Boston:* Small, Maynard & Co., 1922.

Shettle, G. T.—John Wiclif of Wycliffe, and Other Essays. With a foreword by Howard Pease. *Leeds:* R. Jackson, 1922.

Smith, C. Alphonso. — Selected Stories from O. Henry. Edited. *New York:* Doubleday, Page & Co., 1922. $1.25.

Thompson, A. Hamilton.—Selections from the Poems of Sir Walter Scott. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1922. $1.50. xl, 196 pp.

Untermeyer, Louis. — Modern American and British Poetry. Edited. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922.

GERMAN

Aeppli, Ernst. — Spittelers Imago. Eine Analyse. *Frauenfeld u. Leipzig:* Huber & Co., 1922. 107 pp. F. 4.

Betzendörfer, W. — Hölderlins Studienjahre im Tübinger Stift. *Heilbronn:* E. Salzer, 1922. 138 pp. M. 18.

Bruns, Friedrich. — A Book of German Lyrics. Selected and edited with Notes and Vocabulary. *Boston:* D. C. Heath & Co. [1921]. 5 + 194 pp.

—— Modern Thought in the German Lyric Poets from Goethe to Dehmel [Univ. of Wisconsin Studies in Lang. and Lit. No. 13.]. *Madison:* 1921. 103 pp.

Csaki, Richard.—Vorbericht zu einer Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in Siebenbürgen. *Hermannstadt:* Krafft, 1920. 118 pp.

Dehmel, Richard. — Ausgewählte Briefe aus den Jahren 1883-1902. *Berlin:* S. Fischer, 1922. xi + 469 pp. Bound, M. 110

Dickmann, A. B.—Zur Sprache der Frühlyrik Friedrich Rückerts. I. Teil: Vom Wort. Diss. *Münster:* 1921. 56 pp.

Geibels Werke. Hrsg. v. W. Stammler. Kritisch durchges. u. erläuterte Ausg. *Leipzig:* Bibliogr. Institut [1920]. 3 vols. bound, M. 63.

Gerullis, G.—Die altpreussischen Ortsnamen gesammelt und sprachlich behandelt. *Berlin:* Ver. wissensch. Verleger, 1922. v + 286 pp. M. 75.

Goethe (Katharine Elisabeth), Frau Rat: Gesammelte Briefe. Anhang: Goethe's Briefe an seine Mutter. Hrsg. von L. Geiger. Neudruck. *Leipzig:* Hesse & Becker [1922]. xxxv + 587 pp. Cloth, M. 90.

Gotthardt, Dr.—Die Stellung Annettens v. Droste-Hülshoff zum Volksliede und Volksmärchen an Hand bisher ungedruckter Lieder. [Frankfurter zeitgemässe Broschüren, Bd. 40, Hft. 12]. *Hamm, Westf.:* Breer & Thiemann, 1921. Pp. iii, 285-307.

Heusler, Andr.—Die deutsche Quelle der Ballade von Kremolds Rache [Sitzungsber. d. Preuss. Akad. Philos.-hist. Kl. 1921. XXXII]. *Berlin:* Vereinigung Wiss. Verl., 1921. Pp. 445-469. M. 4.

Hoffmann, P. T. — Der mittelalterliche Mensch gesehen aus Welt und Umwelt Notkers des Deutschen. *Gotha:* Perthes, 1921. 356 pp.

Kaminski, Ernst. — Gertrud Moller, die Pregelhirtin. Diss. [S. A. aus Altpreuss. Monatsschrift, 57. Bd.] *Königsberg:* 1920.

Klaar, A.—Probleme der modernen Dramatik. [Philosophische Reihe Bd. 36.] *München:* Rösl & Cie., 1921. 204 pp. Boards, M. 25.

Kluckhohn, P.—Die Auffassung der Liebe in der Literatur des 18. Jhs. u. in der deutschen Romantik. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1922. xiii + 640 pp. M. 100.

Koller, Hans A.—Studien zu M. v. Ebner-Eschenbach. Diss. *Zürich:* 1920. 78 pp.

Kraus, Carl v.—Die Lieder Reimars des Alten. Teil I-III. *München:* 1919. 89, 67, 81 pp., 4°.

Krueger, Th. — Richard Dehmel als religiössittlicher Charakter. Eine Studie zur Neu-Mystik. *Tübingen:* Mohr, 1922. 43 pp. M. 9.

Lessing, O. E.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in ihren Grundzügen. *Dresden:* Carl Reissner, 1921. 345 pp. 4°.

Märtens, Ilse.—Die Mythologie bei Mörike. Diss. *Marburg:* 1921. 187 pp.

Müller-Jabusch, M.—Thersites. Die Erinnerungen des deutschbaltischen Journalisten Garlieb Merkel 1796-1817. Hrsg. u. mit Zwischenkapiteln versehen. *Berlin:* Deu. Verlagsges. f. Politik. u. Gesch. ix + 220 pp.

Öhmann, E.—Zur Geschichte der Adjektivabstrakta auf *-ida, -î,* und *-heit* im Deutschen. *Helsinki:* 1921. 55 pp.

Payer zum Thurn, Rudolf. — Grillparzer über sich selbst. Ein Aktenfaszikel zusammengestellt von —. *Leipzig:* Amaltheа-Verlag [1921]. vii pp., 1 plate, 62 pp. in facsimile. folio. M. 400.

Rauh, H. L.—Die Frankfurter Mundart in ihren Grundzügen dargestellt. *Frankfurt a. M.:* Diesterweg, 1921. 32 pp. M. 6.

Sander, Ernst.—Rudolf Huch. Der Dichter und das Werk. Eine Studie. *Braunschweig:* C. Appelhans & Co., 1922. 38 pp. M. 12.

Schiller, Sämtliche Werke. Volksausgabe in 12 Teilen. Mit . . . Einleitung von Alb. Ludwig. *Leipzig:* Hesse & Becker [1922]. Cloth, M. 240.

Schnass, F.—Hebbels Lyrik und Epik im Rahmen seines Lebens. *Prag:* Haase, 1921. 58 pp. M. 8.50.

Schön, Friedr.—Geschichte der deutschen Mundartdichtung. Teil 2. Die nieder- mittel- u. oberdeutsche Mundartdichtung von der Zeit der niederdeutschen Klassiker bis zur Gegenwart. *Freiburg i. B.:* Fehsenfeld, 1921. 130 pp., boards, M. 30.

Schwietering, Jul. — Die Demutsformel mittelhochdeutscher Dichter [Abh. d. kgl. Ges. d. Wäss. zu Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Kl. N. F. Bd. 17. 3]. *Berlin:* Weidmann, 1922. ii + iii + 89 pp. 4°. M. 7.

Stammler, W.—Mittelniederdeutsches Lesebuch. *Hamburg:* Paul Hartung, 1921. 148 pp., bound, M. 25.

Vogt, Friedr. — Französischer und deutscher Nationalgeist im Rolandslied und im Nibelungenlied. Rede zur akad. Feier d. Reichsgründung am 18. Jan. 1922 gehalten. *Marburg:* Elwert, 1922. 28 pp. M. 6.

—— Geschichte der mhd. Literatur. 1. Teil 3. umgearb. Aufl. [Grundriss d. deu. Literaturgesch. 2.] *Berlin:* Ver. wissensch. Verleger, 1922. x + 363 pp. M. 55.

Wasserzieher, E. — Woher? Ableitendes Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. 5., stark verm. u. verb. Aufl. *Berlin:* Dümmler, 1922. 245 pp. Boards, M. 28.

Zipper, Alb.—Schillers Kabale und Liebe. Erläutert [Reclams Universal-Bibliothek Nr. 6287]. *Leipzig:* Ph. Reclam jun. [1922]. 80 pp. M. 3.—

FRENCH

Antoine.—Mes Souvenirs sur le Théâtre libre. *Paris:* Arthème Fayard, 1922. 324 pp. Fr. 6.50.

Atkinson, G.—The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature from 1700 to 1720. *Paris:* Champion, 1922. 147 pp.

Barker, J. A. — Present-day commercial French correspondence. *New York:* Dutton. 1921. 96 pp. $1.25.

Barthou, L.—Réponse au discours de M. Joseph Bédier. *Paris:* Champion, 1921. 54 pp.

Beaufort et Tilkin. — Petit glossaire de termes inédits. *Liége:* L. Tilkin, 1921. 42 pp. Fr. 2.50.

Bédier, J.—Les Légendes épiques 2e éd. La Légende des "Enfances" de Charlemagne etc. Richard de Normandie dans les chansons de geste etc. *Paris:* Champion, 1921. 4 vols.

—— Discours de réception à l'Académie fr. *Paris:* Champion, 1921. 52 pp.

Bruno, G.—Le tour de la France par deux enfants, ed. with notes, ex., questions, vocab. by E. A. Whitenack. *Boston:* Allyn & Bacon, 1921. viii + 228 pp. 80 cts.

Bussom, T. W.—The Life and Works of Pradon. U. of Minnesota diss. *Paris:* Champion, 1922. 195 pp.

Chaytor, H. J. — A manual of French. *New York:* Macmillan, 1922. vi + 138 pp. $1.50.

Croisset, F. de. — Théâtre. IV. *Paris:* Flammarion, 1922. 281 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Cyrano de Bergerac.—Les Œuvres libertines. Notice biographique par F. Lachèvre. *Paris:* Champion, 1921. 2 vols. cliv + 208 + 239 pp.

Daniels, W. M.—Contes de la France contemporaine. *Boston:* Heath, 1922. 264 pp.

Desbordes-Valmore.—Œuvres manuscrites. *Paris:* Lemerre, 1921. 283 pp.

Erckmann-Chatrian.—Histoire d'un conscrit de 1813, ed. with notes, ex., and vocab. by M. Stathers. *Boston:* Ginn, 1922. viii + 288 pp.

Ferreccio, J.—Essai d'étude intégrale des substantifs. *Paris:* Champion, 1921. 69 pp.

Gauthier-Ferrières.—Anthologie des écrivains fr. du XVIIIe siècle. *Paris:* Larousse. 162 pp. Fr. 4.50.

Hervieu, P.—La Course du flambeau, ed with introd., notes, vocab. by G. N. Henning. *Boston:* Heath, 1922. vi + 151 pp.

Jameson and Heacox.—Chants de France. *Boston:* D. C. Heath, 1922. viii + 148 pp. $1.40.

Lacour, L.—Les premières Actrices françaises. *Paris:* Libr. fr., 1921. 229 pp.

Lély, G. — Chefs-d'œuvre des poètes galants du XVIIIe siècle. *Paris:* Jouve, 1922. viii + 199 pp. Fr. 6.

Luria and Chankin. — Lectures élémentaires avec ex. *New York:* Holt, 1922. xxii + 182 pp.

Mann, W. E.—Robinson Crusoé en France. Diss. *Paris:* A. Davy, 1916. 290 pp.

Péricaud, L. — Le Panthéon des comédiens, de Molière à Coquelin aîné. *Paris:* Fasquelle, 1922. vi + 372 pp. Fr. 15.

Perley, Fannie.—Que Fait Gaston? *Boston:* Heath, 1922. v + 134 pp.

Rostand, E. — Deux romanciers de Provence, Honoré d'Urfé et Emile Zola. *Paris:* H. Laurens, 1921. 153 pp.

Wolff, P.—Théâtre. I. *Paris,* Flammarion, 1921. 288 pp. Fr. 7.

ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante.—Epistolae. Testo, versione e commento per cura di A. Monti. *Milano:* U. Hoepli, 1921. xxiv + 406 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca classico-letteraria.)

—— Il Codice Trivulziano 1080 della Divina Commedia riprodotto in eliocromia sotto gli auspici della sezione milanese della Società Dantesca Italiana, con una introduzione di Luigi Rocca. *Milano:* U. Hoepli, 1921. Fol., viii + 237 pp. L. 750.

—— La Divina Commedia commentata per le scuole e per gli studiosi da G. Federzoni. Vol. I: Inferno. *Bologna:* L. Cappelli, 1921. 610 pp. L. 12.

—— La Divina Commedia illustrata nei luoghi e nelle persone a cura di C. Ricci. *Milano:* U. Hoepli, 1921. Fol., 1120 pp. L. 600. (Edizione del secentenario della morte di Dante.)

Ambrogini, Angelo (Poliziano). — Le Stanzo l'Orfeo e le Rime. Introduzione e note di A. Momigliano. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1921. 200 pp. L. 6. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, LV.)

Battelli, G.—Dante e s. Benedetto. Lettura tenuta da — nella chiesa di Badia in Firenze. *Firenze:* G. Giannini e Figlio, 1921. L. 2.

—— Dante nelle memorie dei poeti italiani. Con introduzione e note a cura di —. *Firenze:* G. Giannini e Figlio, 1921. 154 pp. L. 20.

Bertoni, G.—Poeti e poesie del medio evo e del Rinascimento. *Modena:* U. Orlandini, 1921. 350 pp. L. 28.

Chartularium studii bononiensis. Documenti per la storia dell'Università di Bologna. *Bologna:* L. Cappelli, 1921. Vol. V, 320 pp. L. 50. Vol. VI, 282 pp. L. 30.

De Roberto, F.—Leopardi. Nuova edizione con un avvertimento dell'autore e il fac-simile di una lettera di G. Carducci. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1921. xii + 302 pp. L. 7.

Facchinetti, V.—San Francesco d'Assisi. *Milano:* Santa Lega Eucaristica, 1921. xlviii + 542 pp. L. 60.

Falce, A.—Il marchese Ugo di Tuscia. Ricerche. *Firenze:* R. Bemporad e Figlio, 1921. xii + 269 pp. Lire 30. (Pubblicazioni del R. Istituto di Studi Superiori Pratici e di Perfezionamento in Firenze. Sezione di filologia e filosofia, n. s., II.)

Franco, M.—Saggio di provincialismi siciliani. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1921. 80 pp. L. 2.50.

Insinga, A.—La tensione intellettuale dell'immagine nell'Inferno dantesco. *Palermo:* Libreria Moderna, 1921. 31 pp. L. 3.

Monti, Vincenzo.—Poemetti mitologici. Introduzione e note di N. Vaccalluzzo. *Torino:* Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1921. 260 pp. L. 7. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, XLVI.)

Parini, G.—Il Giorno. I. Il Mattino. Il Mezzogiorno. Edited with introduction and notes by A. F. Johnson. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1921. xi + 95 pp.

Pascal, C.—La sorella di Giacomo Leopardi. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1921. viii + 70 pp. L. 3.

Pellico, Silvio.—Dei doveri degli uomini. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1921. 83 pp. L. 2.25. (Biblioteca di filosofia e pedagogia.)

Roggero, E.—Le nostre madri, ricordate dai migliori scrittori italiani passati e viventi. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1921. xii + 268 pp. L. 6.

Rotondi, G.—Federico Frezzi. La vita e l'opera. *Todi:* Casa editrice Atanòr, 1921. L. 7. (Biblioteca Umbra, X.)

Samperisi, G.—La poesia di Mario Rapisardi. *Palermo:* A. Trimarchi, 1921. viii + 312 pp. L. 10.

SPANISH

Alonso Cortés, N.—Miscelánea vallisoletana. Tercera serie. *Valladolid:* Tipografía "Cuesta," 1921. 4to., 182 pp.

Anuario de la Real Academia Española, 1922. *Madrid:* Perlado, Páez y Ca., 1922. 222 pp.

Buchanan, M. A.—The Chronology of Lope de Vega's Plays. *Toronto:* The University of Toronto Library, 1922. 25 pp. 50 cts. (The University of Toronto Studies, Philological Series, no. 6.)

Caro, M. A.—Obras completas. Tomo I. Flos poetarum. El cinco de mayo, de Manzoni. Edición oficial hecha bajo la dirección de V. E. Caro y A. Gómez Restrepo. *Bogotá:* Impr. Nacional, 1918. 4to., xii + 439 pp.

Carrillo del Valle, J.—Apuntes gramaticales. Opúsculo primero. *Cartagena:* Tip. Vda. de M. Cases, 1908. 8vo., 66 + 6 pp.

Cavada, F. J.—Diccionario manual isleño. Provincialismos de Chiloé (Chile). *Santiago de Chile:* Impr. Yolanda, 1921. 138 pp.

Chacón y Calvo, J. M.—Ensayos de literatura cubana. *Madrid:* Editorial "Saturnino Calleja," 1922. 277 pp. 6 pes. (Biblioteca Calleja, 1ª serie.)

—— Las cien mejores poesías cubanas. Colección antológica formada por —. *Madrid:* Talleres tip. Editorial Reus, 1922. 316 pp.

Domínguez Roldán, G.—La literatura cubana. Necesidad de su enseñanza. Conferencia leída en la Universidad Nacional el 6 de febrero de 1915. *Habana:* Impr. "El Siglo XX," 1915. 4to., 23 pp.

Francos Rodríguez, J.—Días de la Regencia. Recuerdos de lo que fué. 1886-1889. *Madrid:* Editorial "Saturnino Calleja," 1922. 277 pp. 4.50 pes. (Biblioteca Calleja, 1ª serie.)

Gorbea Lemmi, E. de.—Los mil años de Elena Fortún. Magerit. *Madrid:* Editorial "Saturnino Calleja," 1922. 285 pp. (Colección de novelas nuevas.)

Jardiel, F.—Algunos sermones, discursos, artículos y poesías del Deán de Zaragoza —. *Zaragoza:* Talleres tip. de Salvador hermanos, 1920. 4to., 703 + 3 + vii pp.

Marcial Dorado, C., and Ray, M. L.—Trozos modernos. Selections from modern Spanish writers. Edited with notes, direct method exercises and vocabulary by —. *Boston:* Ginn and Co., 1922. iv + 195 pp.

Onís, F. de.—Memoria del curso 1920-1921 presentada al Consejo general ejecutivo por —. Junta para ampliación de estudios, Instituto de las Españas en los Estados Unidos. *Madrid:* Impr. Maroto, 1921. 59 pp.

Trueba, A. de.—Cuentos y cantares. With introduction, notes, exercises and vocabulary by E. Gray. *Boston:* Ginn & Co., 1922. xii + 161 pp.

Varona, E. J.—Ramillete poético. Colección de sonetos heroicos, sagrados, filosóficos, amorosos y festivos de insignes poetas españoles, ordenada con breves notas por —. *La Habana:* Impr. "El Siglo XX," 1921. 4to., 232 pp.

GENERAL

Jacobsohn, H. — Arier und Ugrofinnen. *Göttingen:* Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922. viii + 262 pp. M. 48.

Kurath, Hans.—The Semantic Sources of the Words for the Emotions in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and the Germanic Languages. Dissertation. University of Chicago. *Menasha:* George Banta, 1922.

Tegethoff, E.—Studien zum Märchentypus von Amor und Psyche [Rheinische Beiträge Bd. 4]. *Bonn:* K. Schroeder, 1922. 133 pp. 4°. M. 30.

Wiehr, Josef. — Knut Hamsun, his personality and his outlook upon life [Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, Vol. III, Nos. 1-2]. *Northampton, Mass.:* Smith College, 1922. 130 pp.

Tuberville, A. S.—Mediaeval Heresy and the Inquisition. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1922. $4.00.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Atkins, J. W. H.—The Owl and the Nightingale. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, Translation and Glossary. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1922. xc + 231 pp. $5.00.

Atkinson, F. M.—The Legend of Ulenspiegel and Lamme Ogedzak, by Charles de Coster. Translated. 2 vols. *New York:* Doubleday, Page & Co., 1922.

Barnes, Nellie.—American Indian Verse-Characteristics of Style. [Bulletin of the University of Kansas, vol. XXII, no. 18.] *Lawrence:* University of Kansas, 1921.

Bartlett, Henrietta C.—Mr. William Shakespeare. *New Haven:* Yale University Press, 1922.

Bennett, H. S.—The Pastors and their England. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1922. 15 sh.

Chadwick, D.—Social Life in the Days of Piers Plowman. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1922. 10 sh. 6 d.

Chapman, John Jay.—A Glance toward Shakespeare. *Boston:* The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1922. $1.25.

Contemporary British Literature.—*London:* G. Harrup & Co., 1922. 5 sh.

De Reul, Paul.—L'Œuvre de Swinburne. Avec un portrait et un autographe. *London and New York:* Oxford University Press, 1922. $6.00.

Draper, John W.—The Summa of Romanticism. [Reprinted from *The Colonade* XIV.]

—— Spenserian Biography. [Reprinted from *The Colonade* XIV.]

Emerson, O. F.—Some Notes on the Pearl. [Reprinted from *PMLA.* XXXVII, No. 1.]

—— Grendel's Motive in Attacking Heorot. [Reprinted from *MLR.* XVI.]

Endter, W.—König Alfreds des Grossen Bearbeitung der Soliloquien des Augustus. [Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa XI. Band.] *Hamburg:* Henri Grand, 1922. xiii + 97 pp.

Egan, Rose F.—The Genesis of the Theory of "Art for Art's Sake." [Smith College Studies in Modern Languages II, 4.] 61 pp. *Northampton:* Smith College, 1922.

Grossmann, R.—Spanien und das elisabethanische Drama. Diss. Leipzig, 1920. 138 pp.

Gummere, Richard Mott.—Seneca the Philosopher and his modern Message. [Series: Our Debt to Greece and Rome.] *Boston:* Marshall Jones Co., 1922.

Havens, Raymond Dexter.—The Influence of Milton on English Poetry. *Cambridge:* xii + 722 pp. $7.50. Harvard University Press, 1922.

Heydrick, Benjamin A.—Types of the Essay. Selected and edited. *New York:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922. xv + 373 pp.

Holmquist, Erik.—On the History of the English Present Inflections, particularly *-th* and *-s*. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1922. xvi + 194 pp. $1.60.

Hubbell, Jay B. and Beaty, John O.—An Introduction to Poetry. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1922. xxvii + 524 pp.

Inge, William Ralph.—The Victorian Age. The Rede Lecture for 1922. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1922. $1.00.

Kershaw, N.—Anglo-Saxon and Norse Poems. Edited and translated, with introduction, notes and appendix. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1922. xiv + 207 pp. $4.50.

Klaeber, Fr.—Beowulf and The Fight at Finnsburg. Edited, with Introduction, Bibliography, Notes, Glossary, and Appendices. *Boston:* D. C. Heath & Co., 1922. clxii + 412 pp.

Murry, J. Middleton.—The Problem of Style. *Oxford and New York:* Oxford University Press, 1922. viii + 148 pp. 6 sh. 6 d.

Price, Candelent.—Keats Finales: 'Hyperion' and 'The Eve of Saint Mark.' *London:* Daniel, 1922. 5 sh.

Rolli, Augustus.—Guide to Carlyle. *Boston:* Small, Maynard & Co., 1922. 2 vols.

Sadleir, Michael.—Excursions in Victorian Bibliography. *London:* Chaundy & Cox. 1922. vii + 240 pp. 21 sh.

Schücking, Levin L.—Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays. Translated by W. H. Peters. *New York:* Henry Holt & Co., 1922. $3.50.

Taylor, Archer.—The Gallows of Judas Iscariot. [Reprinted from Washington University Studies IX, Humanistic Series no. 2.]

Thaler, Alwin.—Strolling Players and Provincial Drama After Shakespeare. [Reprinted from *PMLA.* XXXVII.]

Wiegert, Hans.—'Jim an' Nell,' von W. F. Rock. Eine Studie zum Dialekt von Devonshire. *Berlin:* 1921. xiii + 344 pp.

Woods, George B.—A College Handbook of Writing. *New York:* Doubleday, Page & Co., 1922. $1.20.

Young, Karl.—Ordo Prophetarum. [Reprinted from the Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters, vol. XX.]

GERMAN

Bender, Annie.—Thomas Abbt. Ein Beitrag zur Darstellung des erwachenden Lebensgefühls im 18. Jh. *Bonn:* F. Cohen, 1922. 215 pp. M. 48.

Curme, George O.—A Grammar of the German Language designed for a thoro and practical study of the language as spoken and written to-day. Revised and Enlarged. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1922. xii + 623 pp.

Ehrismann, Gustav.—Geschichte der deutschen Lit. bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. Teil 2. Die mhd. Lit. 1. Frühmhd. Zeit. *München:* C. H. Beck, 1922. xviii + 358 pp. M. 190.

Enzinger, Moriz.—Das deutsche Schicksalsdrama. Eine akademische Antrittsvorlesung. *Innsbruck:* Verlagsanstalt Tyrolia [1922]. 48 pp. M. 25.

Feist, Sigmund.—Einführung in das Gotische. Texte mit Übers. u. Erl. *Leipzig:* Teubner, 1922. vi + 156 pp. M. 40.

Fries, Albert.—Intime Beobachtungen zu Grillparzers Stil und Versbau mit Exkursen zu Klopstocks, Goethes und Shakespeares Stil. [Germanische Studien, H. 18]. *Berlin:* E. Ebering, 1922. xv + 400 pp. M. 120.

Hartig, Otto.—Christoph Schorer von Memmingen und sein "Sprachverderber" (1643). [Sitzungsber. d. Bayer. Akad., Phil.-hist. Kl. Jg. 1921, Abh. 2.] *München:* G. Franz, 1922. 64 pp. M. 6.

Johnson, Elizabeth F.—Weckherlin's Eclogues of the Seasons. [Johns Hopkins Diss.] *Tübingen:* H. Laupp Jr., 1922. 67 pp.

Jolivet, A.—Wilhelm Heinse. Sa vie et son œuvre jusqu' en 1787. *Paris:* F. Rieder et Cie, 1922. 392 pp. Fr. 25.

Karstien, C.—Die reduplizierten Perfekta des Nord- und Westgermanischen. [Giessener Beiträge zur Deutschen Philologie. 1.] *Giessen:* v. Münchow, 1921. xii + 169 pp. M. 40.

Manthey-Zorn, O.—Germany in Travail. [The Amherst Books]. *Boston:* Marshall Jones Co. [1922]. ix + 139 pp. $2.00.

Meyer, Richard M.—Die Weltliteratur im 20. Jh. Vom deutschen Standpunkt aus betrachtet. 2. A. bis zur Gegenwart fortgeführt von P. Wiegler. *Stuttgart:* Deu. Verlagsanstalt, 1922. viii + 311 pp. Bound, M. 85.

Müller, Günther.—Brentanos Romanzen vom Rosenkranz. Magie u. Mystik in romantischer und klassischer Prägung. *Göttingen:* Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922. iv + 95 pp. M. 30.

Pfannmüller, Gustav. — Die Religion Friedrich Hebbels auf Grund der Werke, Tagebücher u. Briefe dargestellt. *Göttingen:* Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922. vi + 198 pp., M. 70.

Reichard, H. H.—Pennsylvania-German Dialect Writings and their Writers. *Lancaster, Pa.:* Pennsylvania-German Society, 1918. 400 pp.

Rother. Herausgegeben v. Jan de Vries. [German. Bibl, 2. Abt., Bd. 13.] *Heidelberg:* Winter, 1922. cxv + 129 pp. M. 28.

Schauer, Maria.—Caroline Schlegel-Schelling. *Greifswald:* K. Moninger, 1922. 75 pp. M. 10.

Sillib, Rudolf.—Zur Geschichte der grossen Heidelberger (Mannessischen) Liederhs. u. anderen Pfälzer Hss. [Sitzungsber. d. Heidelb. Akad. Philos.-hist. Kl., 1921, Abh. 3]. *Heidelberg:* Winter, 1921. 27 pp. M. 4.80.

Slater, E. I.—Practical German Grammar. A Course of Lessons, with Vocabulary. Exercises and Conversational Sentences. *London:* Pitman, 1919. 143 pp. 2sh. 6d.

Steinberg, Hans. — Die Reyen in den Trauerspielen des Andreas Gryphius. Diss. *Göttingen:* 1921. 123 pp.

Stockmeyer, Clara.—Soziale Probleme im Drama des Sturmes und Dranges. Teildruck, Kap. II: Das Ständeproblem. Diss. *Basel:* 1920. 104 pp.

Thomas, Robert.—Wandlungen der deutschen Sprache seit Goethe und Schiller. *Augsburg:* Gebr. Reichel, 1922. 23 pp. M. 2.50.

Wilhelm, Friedr.—Zur Geschichte des Schrifttums in Deutschland bis zum Ausgang des 13. Jhs. 2. [Münchener Archiv, H. 8.] *München:* G. D. W. Callwey, 1921. Pp. vii + 57-162. M. 30.

Wolff, Rud.—Die neue Lyrik. Eine Einführung in das Wesen jüngster Dichtung. *Leipzig:* Dieterich, 1922. vii + 68 pp. M. 15.

FRENCH

Barbier, P.—English influence in the French vocab. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1922. 44 pp. $1.20.

Benedetto, L. F.—Mme de Warens, la "Maman" de Rousseau. *Florence:* Le Monnier. 328 pp. L. 7.50.

Bibliothèque de l'Institut fr. de Florence. 1re série. 1. Maugain, Fénelon in Italia. Fr. 11.50. 2. Levi-Malvano, Montesquieu e Machivelli. Fr. 7.50. 4. Maugain, Carducci e la Francia. Fr. 9. *Paris: Champion.*

Brunot, F.—La Pensée et la langue. Méthode, principes et plan d'une théorie nouvelle du langage appliquée au français. *Paris:* Masson, 1922. xxxvi + 955 pp.

Casnati, F.—P. Claudel e i suoi drammi. *Como:* Omarini, 1919. v + 155 pp. L. 5.

Curtius, E. R.—Maurice Barrès u. die geistigen Grundlagen des franz. Nationalismus. *Bonn:* F. Cohen, 1921. viii + 255 pp. M. 30.

Duine, F.—La Mennais, sa vie, ses idées, ses ouvrages. *Paris:* Garnier, 1922. 389 pp.

Friedmann, W.—Molières Leben u. Werke. *Berlin:* Propyläen-Verlag. 119 pp.

Gerold, Théodore.—L'art du chant en France; au 17e siècle. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press. xvi + 278 pp. $6.

—— Le MS. de Bayeux; texte et musique d'un recueil de chansons du 15e siècle. *Ibid.* lvi + 128 pp. $2.80.

Haggard, A. C. P.—Madame de Staël. *New York:* Doran, 1922. x + 295 pp. $5.

Hatzfeld, H.—P. Claudel u. R. Rolland. *München:* Rösl, 1921. 161 pp. M. 13.

Henke, W.—Der Verwendung phantastischer u. okkulter Motive in der Erzählungsliteratur H. de Balzacs. Diss. *Greifswald.*

Hock, C. A.—Der Realismus in Scarron's "Roman comique." Diss. *Bonn:* 78 pp.

Jacob, H.—Das Leben des Dichters J.-A. Rimbaud. *München:* Recht, 1921. M. 25.

Lanson, R. et Desseignet, J.—La France et sa civilisation. *New York:* Holt, 1922. 296 pp.

Lerber, W. de.—L'Influence de Clément Marot aux xviime et xviiime siècles. *Paris:* Champion, 1920. xvi + 128 pp.

Macirone, T.—Practical French phonetics. *Boston:* Allyn & Bacon, 1921. 147 pp. 80 cts.

Mélanges offerts à M. B. Bouvier. *Geneva:* Soc. anon. des éds. Sonor. viii + 360 pp.

Mélanges offerts à M. G. Lanson. *Paris:* Hachette, 1922. 534 pp.

Méras, A. A.—La France éternelle. *New York:* Am. Bk. Co., 1922. 313 pp. 80 cts.

Neri, F.—Il Chiabrera e la pleiade francese. *Turin:* Bocca, 1920. 219 pp. L. 10.

Oehlert, R.—E. Zola als Theaterdichter. Diss. *Berlin:* 1920. 145 pp.

Ott, A. C.—Gaultier de Coincy's Christinenleben. *Erlangen:* Jonge, 1922. clxxvi + 352 pp. (Beiträge z. Kenntnis d. altfr. hagiographischen Lit. I).

Peters, G.—Die Frau in der franz. Kunstepik des 12. Jahrhunderts bis zu Christian von Troyes. Diss. *Königsberg.*

Porto, F.—Studî rabelesiani. *Catania:* Battiato. 94 pp.

Rema, E.—Voltaires Geliebte. *Dresden:* C. Reissner, 1920. 212 pp. M. 14.

Rubensohn, G.—Die "correspondance littéraire." Fr. M. Grimm u. H. Meister. Diss. *Berlin:* x + 173 pp.

Sorice, M.—Lamartine. *S. Maria Capua Vetere:* tip. Progresso, 1920. 70 pp.

Thibaudet, A.—La vie de M. Barrès. *Paris:* Nouv. rev. fr., 1921. 313 pp. Fr. 10.

Vargiu, E. M.—Fr. Coppée, il poeta degli umili. *Rome:* Cuggiani. 96 pp. L. 8.

Wachter, P.—A. de Musset u. die Musik. Diss. *Greifswald.* 76 pp.

Wiegler, P.—Anatole France. *München:* Musarion-Verlag. M. 4.

Zweig, S.—Romain Rolland. *Frankfurt a. M.:* Rütten & Löning. 266 pp. M. 27.

ITALIAN

Aragona, M.—Di alcune parole calabresi che hanno riscontro nella lingua francese e non nell' italiana, e della loro etimologia. *Roma:* Casa ed. ital., 1922. 11 pp.

Benedetti, F. A. de.—Dante e i tre regni danteschi. Lezioni introduttive allo studio del poeta e della Divina Commedia. *Napoli:* P. Federico e G. Ardia, 1922. 193 pp. L. 3.

Besutti, A.—Il Veltro tra Feltro e Feltro. Soluzione dell' enigma di Dante Alighieri. *Asola:* Tip. Scalini-Carrara e C., 1922. 234 pp. L. 8.

Caratelli, L. C.—The Popes in the Divina Commedia of Dante. *London:* Sands, 1922. 3sh. 6d.

Chroust, G.—Saggi di letteratura italiana moderna. Da G. Carducci al futurismo. Con note biografiche, bibliografiche e dichiarative. Abt. 3. *Würzburg:* Kabitsch und Mönnich, 1922. Pp. 281-535. M. 74.

Dante, la vita, le opere, le grandi città dantesche, Dante e l'Europa. *Milano:* Fratelli Treves, 1922. viii + 377 pp. L. 20.

—— e Verona. Studi pubblicati a cura di A. Avena e Pieralvise di Serego Alighieri, in occasione del secentenario dantesco. *Verona:* Tip. Cooperativa, 1921. 424 pp.

Fabris, G.—Il simbolismo nel prologo della Divina Commedia. Note ed appunti. *Vicenza:* Tip. G. Rumor, 1922. 45 pp.

Fiore, Il, e il Detto d'Amore, a cura di E. G. Parodi con note al testo, glossario e indici. In appendice a Le Opere di Dante edite dalla Società dantesca italiana. *Firenze:* Bemporad e figlio, 1921.

Flora, F.—Dal romanticismo al futurismo. *Piacenza:* Casa ed. V. Porta, 1922. xxvii + 311 pp. L. 10.

Fogazzaro, A.—Piccolo mondo moderno. Romanzo. *Milano:* U. Hoepli, 1921. viii + 461 pp. L. 8.50. (Edizione giubilare. Biblioteca classico-letteraria.)

Fucile, L.—Vittorio Alfieri e l'autocritica alla "Cleopatra." Saggio. *Messina:* Tip. S. Guerriera, 1922.

Gabrieli, G.—Dante e l'oriente. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1922. xi + 138 pp.. L. 10.

Gatto, G.—L'Amphitruo di Plauto e le imitazioni di L. Dolce e Molière. *Catania:* Monachini, 1922. 98 pp. L. 5.

Hauvette, H.—Etudes sur la Divine Comédie. La composition du poème et son rayonnement. *Paris:* Champion, 1922. xv + 239. Fr. 10. (Bibliothèque littéraire de la Renaissance, XII.)

Lavore, G.—Ugolino della Gherardesca nella vita e nell' Inferno di Dante. *Noto:* Tip. Zammit, 1922. 25 pp.

Leopardi, Giacomo.—I canti. Introduzione e note di V. Piccoli. Nuova edizione. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1921. 286 pp. L. 9.50. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

Levi, E.—Piccarda e Gentucca. Studi e ricerche dantesche. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1922. viii + 108 pp. L. 7.50.

Livi, G. Dante e Bologna. Nuovi studi e documenti. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1922. 240 pp. L. 20.

Monner Sans, R.—San Francisco de Asís en la poesía clásica y moderna. Canciones de San Francisco. Esbozo de una antología franciscana. 8vo., 198 pp.

Moroncini, E.—A. de Musset e l'Italia. *Rome:* Albrighi, Segati & C. 228 pp. L. 10.

Ricci, C.—L'ultimo rifugio di Dante. Seconda edizione. *Milano:* U. Hoepli, 1921. 480 pp. L. 100.

Serra, R.—Esame di coscienza di un letterato. Edited with introduction and notes by P. Rèbora. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1922. x + 41 pp. 85c. Without introduction and notes, 31 pp. 50c.

Van Horne, J.—Il Risorgimento. Selections edited by —. *Chicago, Ill.:* The University of Chicago Press, 1922. vii + 168 pp. $1.50. (The University of Chicago Italian Series.)

SPANISH

Alarcón, P. A. de.—El final de norma, Edited with introd., notes, ex., vocab. by S. Gutiérrez and E. S. Ingraham. *New York:* Holt, 1922. ix + 304 pp. 96 cts.

Arteaga y Pereira, F. de.—Tierras amigas. Poesías. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1922. 117 pp. $1.50.

Bell, A. F. G.—Baltasar Gracián. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1922. viii + 82 pp. $2.25. (Hispanic Notes and Monographs, III.)

Calleja, R.—El Editor. Conferencia de la serie organizada por la Cámara oficial del libro en la Feria de Muestras de Barcelona en marzo de 1922. *Madrid:* Editorial "Saturnino Calleja," 1922. 65 pp.

Cervantes.—Rinconete y Cortadillo. *Cambridge:* The University Press, 1922. 49 pp. (Cambridge Plain Texts.)

Crawford, J. P. W.—Temas españoles. *New York:* Holt, 1922. viii + 203 pp. $1.00.

Cursos de metodología y alta cultura. Curso de lingüística. Introducción al estudio de la lingüística vasca, por Menéndez Pidal. Metodología de la fonética, por T. Navarro Tomás. El elemento extraño en el lenguaje, por A. Castro. Lexicografía y geografía lingüística, por M. Griera. *Barcelona:* Tip. "La Académica," 1922. 112 pp. (Sociedad de estudios vascos.)

De Vitis, M. A.—Brief Spanish Grammar. *Boston:* Allyn & Bacon, 1922. xxvii + 213 + 44 pp. $1.40.

Estudios. Organo del Instituto Nacional. *Panamá:* 1922. Año I. No. 1.

Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J.—Fray Luis de León. A biographical fragment. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1922. xiv + 261 pp. (Hispanic Notes and Monographs: essays, studies and brief biographies issued by the Hispanic Society of America.)

—— Spanish Literature. A primer. *New York:* Oxford University Press, 1922. iii + 140 pp. $1.20.

Guerrero, E. C.—Diccionario filológico. Estudio sobre el lenguaje venezolano con referencia al de España y al de otros paises de la América latina. *Nictheroy:* Imp. Salesiana, 1922. 376 pp.

Hill, J. M.—Index verborum de Covarrubias Orozco. *Bloomington:* The University of Indiana, 1921. iv + 186 pp. $2.00. (Indiana Univ. Studies.)

Isaacs, J.—María. Edited with notes, ex., vocab. by S. L. Pitcher. *New York:* Macmillan, 1922. xx + 313 pp. $1.20.

Lazarillo de Tormes, La Vida de. Edited by H. J. Chaytor. *New York:* Longmans, Green and Co., 1922. xxx + 65 pp. $1.10. (Modern Language Texts. Spanish Series.)

Luria, M. A.—Lecturas elementales con ejercicios. *New York:* Macmillan, 1922. xxv + 233 pp. $1.20.

Sevilla, A.—Cancionero popular murciano. Recogido, anotado y precedido de una introducción por —. *Murcia:* Sucesores de Nogués, 1922. xx + 399 pp.

Williams, L.—A Dictionary of Spanish Idioms. *New York:* Dutton, 1922. vii + 131 pp. $1.60.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Baum, Paull Franklin.—The Principles of glish Versification. *Cambridge:* Harvard iversity Press, 1922. viii + 215 pp. 00.

Beach, Joseph Warren.—The Technique Thomas Hardy. *Chicago:* University of icago Press, 1922.

Brett-Smith, H. F. B.—The Seven Deadly nes of London, by Thomas Dekker;—cognita, or Love and Duty Reconcil'd., by lliam Congreve. [The Percy Reprints, s. 4 and 5.] *New York and Boston:* ughton Mifflin Co., 1922.

Cairns, William B.—British Criticisms of erican Writings, 1815-1833. [University Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 14.] *Madison:* University of sconsin, 1922.

Coleridge, Stephen.—The Glory of English Prose. *New York:* G. P. Putnam's ns, 1922. $2.00.

Cooke, Delmar Gross. — Wiliam Dean wells. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 22.

Curry, Walter Clyde.—More About Chau-'s Wife of Bath. [Reprinted from *LA.* XXXVII.]

Dibble, Roy F. — Albion W. Tourgée. olumbia University Dissertation.] *New rk:* Lemcke & Buechner, 1921.

Drew, John.—My Years on the Stage. w *York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1922.

English.—The Teaching of English in gland. *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & ., 1922.

Gayley, C. M.—The Charles Mills Gayley niversary Papers, 1889-1919. *Berkeley:* niversity of California Press, 1922. vi, 2 pp.

Gepp, Edward.—A Contribution to an sex Dialect Dictionary. (Supplement t.); also A German Professor on Our Dia-ct. *Colchester:* Benham & Co., 1922. sh.

Hardy, Thomas.—Late Lyrics and Earlier. ndon: The Macmillan Co., 1922. 7 sh. d.

Hearn, Lafcadio. — Pre-Raphaelite and her Poets. Introduction by John Erske. *New York:* Dodd, Mead & Co., 1922.

Herford, C. H.—The Dramatic Poems of ercy Bysshe Shelley. Arranged in chronogical order, with a Preface. *London:* hatto and Windus, 1922. xi, 412 pp. sh. 6d.

Huneker, Josephine. — Letters of James ibbons Huneker, collected and edited. *New rk:* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922. $3.50.

Jente, Richard.—Die mythologischen Ausdrücke im altengl. Wortschatz. [Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 86.] *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1921.

Kidson, Frank.—The Beggar's Opera. Its Predecessors and Successors. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1922. 5sh.

Korten, Herta.—Chaucer's literar. Beziehungen zu Boccaccio. *Rostock:* 1920. 64 pp.

Menner, Robert J.—'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight' and the West Midland. [Reprinted from *PLMA* XXXVII.]

Nicoll, Allardyce.—Dryden as an Adapter of Shakespeare. [Published for the Shakespeare Association.] *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1922. 2sh.

Patch, Howard Rollin.—The Tradition of the Goddess Fortuna in Roman Literature and in the Transitional Period. [Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, vol. III, no. 3.] *Northampton:* Smith College, 1922.

Reed, Arthur W.—The Beginnings of the English Secular and Romantic Drama. [Published for the Shakespeare Society.] *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1922. 2sh.

Rollins, Hyder E.—A Pepysian Garland. Black-Letter Broadside Ballads of the Years 1595-1639. Chiefly from the collection of Samuel Pepys. *Cambridge:* University Press, 1922. xxxi, 491 pp.

Smart, Walter Kay.—Handbook of Effective Writing. *New York:* Harper Bros., 1922. xi + 207 pp.

Spingarn, J. E.—Scholarship and Criticism in the United States. [Reprinted from *Civilization in the United States.*] *New York:* Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922.

Stopes, Charlotte C. — The Seventeenth Century Accounts of the Masters of the Revels. [Published for the Shakespeare Society.] *London:* Humphrey Milford, 1922. 2sh.

Trumbull.—The Poetical Works of John Trumbull, containing 'McFingal,' a modern Epic Poem, revised and corrected with copious explanatory notes, 'The Progress of Dulness,' and a collection of poems on various subjects. *The Colonnade*, vol. XIV 1919-1922). *New York:* The Andiron Club, 1922.

Uhl, Willis Lemon.—Scientific Determination of the Content of the Elementary School Course in Reading. *Madison:* University of Wisconsin, 1921.

Williamson, G. C.—Behind my Library Door. *New York:* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1922. $3.00.

Winchester, Caleb T.—The Old Castle and Other Essays. Edited by L. B. Gillet. *New York:* The Macmillan Co., 1922.

GERMAN

Ammon, H.—Repetitorium der deutschen Literaturgeschichte (von den Anfängen bis Luther). *Berlin:* Ver. wiss. Verleger, 1922. vii + 131 pp. M. 25.

—— Repetitorium der deutschen Sprache, Gotisch, Althochdeutsch, Altsächsisch. *Berlin:* Ver. wiss. Verleger, 1922. viii + 79 pp. M. 18.

Bach, Matthew G.—Wieland's Attitude toward Woman and her Cultural and Social Relations. [Columbia Univ. Germanic Studies]. *New York:* Columbia Univ. Press, 1922. xvi + 100 pp. $1.50.

Bell, Clair H.—The Sister's Son in the Medieval German Epic. A Study in the Survival of Matriliny. [Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology, x, no. 2, pp. 67-182]. *Berkeley:* Univ. of California Press, 1922.

Dehnow, Fritz.—Frank Wedekind. *Leipzig:* O. R. Reisland, 1922. 118 pp. M. 36.

Euphorion, Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte hrsg. von Josef Nadler u. August Sauer. 24. Bd., 1. Hft. *Leipzig u. Wien:* Carl Fromme, 1922. 258 pp.

Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag Gerhart Hauptmanns. *Bielefeld:* Niemeyersche Buchdr., 1922. 22 pp., 4 plates, 4°. M. 40.

Georgy, E. A.—Die Tragödien Friedrich Hebbels nach ihrem Ideengehalt. 3. verb. Aufl. [Das Tragische bei Friedr. Hebbel. Bd. 1]. *Leipzig:* H. Haessel, 1922. xix + 447 pp. M. 300.

Hauptmann, Gerhart, und sein Werk. Hrsg. v. L. Marcuse. *Berlin:* Franz Schneider [1922]. 220 pp. 4°. Bound, M. 400.

Jahresverzeichnis der an den Deutschen Universitäten und Technischen Hochschulen erschienenen Schriften. 36. Jgg. 1920. *Berlin:* Behrend & Co., 1921. v + 852 pp., M. 150.

Klaar, Alfred. — Ludwig Fulda. Leben und Lebenswerk. *Stuttgart:* Cotta, 1922. 91 pp. M. 28.

Levin, Herbert. — Die Heidelberger Romantik. Preisschrift. *München:* Parcus & Co., 1922. 153 pp. M. 50.

Mehlis, Georg.—Die deutsche Romantik. *München:* Rösl & Cie. 1922. 358 pp. M. 120.

Paul, Jean.—Die Briefe Jean Pauls. Hrsg. u. erl. v. Ed. Berend. Bd. 1. 2. *München:* Georg Müller, 1922. M. 450.

Ruland, Ilse.—Wilh. Waiblinger in seinen Prosawerken. *Stuttgart:* W. Kohlhammer, 1922. viii + 91 pp. M. 120.

Seebass, Friedr.—Hölderlin-Bibliographie. [Einzelschriften zur Bücher- u. Hss.-kunde. 3.] *München:* H. Stobbe, 1922. 102 pp. M. 200.

Trendelenburg, A. — Goethes Faust [illegible] klärt. Der Tragödie 1. Teil. *Berlin:* [illegible] wiss. Verl. 1922. x + 490 pp. M. 120.

Uhlendorf, B. A.—Charles Sealsfield. E[illegible] nic Elements and National Problems in [illegible] Works [Repr. fr. "Deutsch-Amerikanis[illegible] Geschichtsblätter, vol. xx-xxi.] *Chica[illegible] Ill.:* [1921]. viii + 242 pp.

Voss, Lena.—Goethes unsterbliche Fre[illegible] din (Charlotte von Stein). Eine psycl[illegible] Studie an der Hand der Quellen. *Leipz[illegible]* Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1921. vii + [illegible] pp. Bound, M. 72.

FRENCH

Angot, E.—Rôles et Caractères dans [illegible] comédies de Molière. *Paris:* Emile-P[illegible] frères, 1922. 257 pp.

Balzac, H. de.—Five Short Stories, ed. Arthur Tilley. *New York:* Macmillan, 19[illegible] xxvii + 170 pp. $1.90.

Bazin, R.—Une tache d'encre, ed. by [illegible] Dubrule. *Boston:* Ginn, 1922. ix + [illegible] pp. 72 cts.

Cambridge Plain Texts. Molière. L'[illegible] mour médecin; le Sicilian. 1922. vi[illegible] 58 pp.

—— Michelet. Saint-Louis. ii + 60 [illegible]

—— V. Hugo. Eviradnus; Ratbert. 19[illegible] vi + 84 pp.

Carette, Mme. — Choix de mémoires [illegible] écrits des femmes fr. Mme de La Fayet[illegible] *Paris:* Ollendorff, 1922. xl + 294 pp.

Daudet, A.—Le Petit Chose, éd. av[illegible] expl. du texte, ex. et lex. par L. Cardo[illegible] *New York:* Holt, 1922. viii + 200 pp.

Daudet, A.—Lettres de mon moulin, [illegible] with notes, ex., illustr., vocab. by O. Robert. *Boston:* Heath, 1922. xvi + 1[illegible] pp.

Esternod, C. d'. — L'Espadon satyriqu[illegible] 1re éd. critique, par F. Fleuret et L. Pe[illegible] ceau. *Paris:* Jean Fort, 1922. xiv + 2[illegible] pp. Fr. 20.

Filleau de La Chaise.—Discours, Intro[illegible] et notes de V. Giraud. *Paris:* Bossar[illegible] 1922. 209 pp.

Fish and d'Avesne.—French commerci[illegible] correspondence. *New York:* Macmilla[illegible] 1922. ix + 230 pp. $1.20.

Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence.—Vie [illegible] Saint Thomas le Martyr, publié par [illegible] Walberg. *Lund:* Gleerup, 1922. clxxx + [illegible] 386 pp.

Hill, C. J. P. — Essentials of Practic[illegible] French. *Boston:* Cornhill, 1922. xx + [illegible] 341 pp.

Hatzfeld, Helmut.—Einführung in der I[illegible] terpretation neufranzösischer Texte. *Mü[illegible] chen:* Max Huber, 1922. 115 pp. M. 15.

Klemperer, V.—Einführung in das Mittelnzösische. (Teubners philosophische Stuenbücher). *Leipzig:* Teubner, 1921. iv 178 pp.

La Mothe le Vayer. — Deux dialogues. tr. et notes par E. Tisserand. *Paris:* ssard, 1922. 283 pp.

Marguerite de Valois. — La Ruelle mal sortie. Intr. et notes de J. H. Mariéjol. *ris:* le Sirène, 1922. 95 pp. Fr. 4.50.

Nitze, W. A. and Dargan, E. P.—A History of French Literature. *New York:* lt, 1922. x + 781 pp. $4.

Rousseau, J.-J. — Discours sur l'origine . de l'inégalité parmi les hommes, ed. by F. Muller and R. E. G. Vaillant. *New rk:* Oxford Press, 1922. xiii + 102 pp.

Sainéan, L.—La Langue de Rabelais. T. Civilisation de la Renaissance. *Paris:* ccard, 1922. xii + 508 pp.

Thibaudet, A.—G. Flaubert. *Paris:* Plonurrit, 1922. 347 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Vexler, F.—Studies in Diderot's Esthetic turalism. *New York:* F. Vexler, 1922. 7 pp.

Watson, M. W.—French Short Stories of -day. Introd., notes, vocab. *New York:* ribner's, 1922. vi + 182 pp. $1.

Zola.—L'Attaque du Moulin, ed. by G. D. rris. *Boston:* Allyn & Bacon, 1922. xxiv 142 pp.

ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia. llständiger Text, mit Erläuterungen, rammatik, Glossar und vielen Tafeln hersgegeben von L. Olschki. 2. verb. Aufl. idelberg: Groos, 1922. xvii + 640 pp.

——La Divina Commedia, commentata C. Steiner. Vol. III: Paradiso. Nuova izione. *Torino:* G. B. Paravia e C., 1921. 8 pp. L. 9. (Biblioteca di classici itani.)

——La Vita Nuova. Edited with introction, notes, and vocabulary, by Kenneth cKenzie. *New York:* D. C. Heath and ., 1922. xxvi + 172 pp. $1.52.

Angst, A.—Dante, seine Zeit und seine mmedia. *Chur:* F. Schuler, 1921. 31 . Fr. 2.

Bonci, E.—Le arti figurative nella Divina mmedia. *Macerata:* Tip. P. Colcerasa, 22. 53 pp.

Ferrari, D.—Commento delle Odi barbare Giosuè Carducci. Libro terzo. *Bologna:* Zanichelli, 1922. xviii + 210 pp. L. 9.50.

Flori, E.—Dell'idea imperiale di Dante; n un'appendice sulla data di composizione De Monarchia. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 22. 234 pp.

Francesco d'Assisi.—Gli scritti, con introduzione e note critiche del P. Vittorino Facchinetti. *Milano:* Soc. ed. Vita e pensiero, 1922. 234 pp. L. 5.

Fregni, G.—Di un verso di Dante e della voce Firenze, e cioè di nuovo sul famoso verso di Dante, e che dice: Pape Satan, Pape Satan aleppe (c. VII dell'Inferno); e di nuovo pure su le tre voci di Firenze, di Fiorenza, ed anche di Florentia: studi critici, filologici e letterari. *Modena:* Soc. tip. modenese, 1922. 21 pp.

Gourmont, R. de.—Dante, Béatrice et la poésie amoureuse. *Paris:* Mercure de France, 1922. 79 pp. Fr. 1.50.

Halusa, T. P.—Dante Alighieri und sein heiliges Lied. *Karlsruhe:* Badenia, A. G. f. Verlag und Druckerei, 1921. viii + 63 pp. M. 9.35.

Loschiavo, G. G.—La materia della Divina Commedia. *Palermo:* Tip. M. Montaina, 1922. 46 pp. L. 8.

Manzoni, A.—Le tragedie, gli inni sacri, le odi, nella forma definitiva e negli abbozzi e con le varianti delle diverse edizioni a cura di M. Scherillo. 3a edizione, del centenario, rinnovata e accresciuta. *Milano:* U. Hoepli, 1921. xvi + 500 pp. L. 12.50. (Biblioteca classica hoepliana.)

Menegazzi, G. B.—Il capolavoro del Monti: l'ode al Signor di Montgolfier. *Vicenza:* Tip. G. Raschi, 1922. 27 pp.

Murari, R.—Dante, l'opera e il monito. *Bologna:* N. Zanichelli, 1922. 96 pp. L. 4.

Olschki, L. — Geschichte der neusprachlichen wissenschaftlichen Literatur. 2. Band: Bildung und Wissenschaft im Zeitalter der Renaissance in Italien. *Firenze:* L. S. Olschki, 1922. x + 344 pp.

Ortiz, R.—La fronda delle penne d'oca nei giardini d'Astrea. Contributo allo studio dei contatti (e dei conflitti) italo-francesi e franco-italiani nel secolo XVII e in . . . altri secoli. *Napoli:* Federico e Ardia, 1922. 170 pp. L. 7.

Pignatti, G.—Un principe letterato del secolo XVI: la vita e gli scritti di Curzio Gonzaga. *Palermo:* R. Sandron, 1922. 178 pp. L. 6.

Ricci, C.—Roma nel pensiero di Dante. *Firenze:* Sansoni, 1922. 30 pp. L. 2.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Rumor, S.—Il culto di Dante a Vicenza. Seconda edizione, riveduta e illustrata. *Vicenza:* Tip. vicentina, 1922. 39 pp.

Santanera, A.—I superbi. Sul canto XI del Purgatorio. *Torino:* Lattes, 1922. 55 pp. L. 4.50.

Santangelo, S.—Tenzoni poetiche italiane del secolo XIII. A cura di —. *Catania:* V. Giannotta, 1922. 19 pp. L. 2.50

Schuchardt, Hugo. Miscellanea linguistica dedicata a — per il suo 80. anniversario (1922). *Firenze:* Olschki, 1922. iv + 221 pp. L. 30. (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum Romanicum," serie II, 3.)

Somarè, E.—Novelle italiane. A cura di —. Vol. I-II. *Milano:* Il Primato editoriale, 1922. xxiii + 250, 270 pp. L. 16.

Sorrento, L.—La diffusione della lingua italiana nel cinquecento in Sicilia. *Firenze:* LeMonnier, 1922. 170 pp. L. 7.50.

SPANISH

Bazán, E. P.—Tesoro de Gastón. Edited with introd., notes, ex., vocab., by Elizabeth McGuire. *New York:* Holt, 1922. xiv + 239 pp.

Blanco y Sánchez, R.—Fundamentos de lengua castellana. Gramática. *Madrid:* Perlado, Paez y Ca., 1921. 235 pp. 2,25 pes.

Bonilla y San Martín, A.—Las Bacantes, o del origen del teatro. *Madrid:* Sucesores de Rivadeneyra, 1922. 4to., 180 pp. (Real Academia Española.)

Castillo, C., y Watson, J. C.—Trozos de castellano, arreglados por —. *New York:* Henry Holt and Co., 1922. vii + 131 pp.

Crawford, J. P. W.—Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega. *Philadelphia:* The University of Pennsylvania, 1922. 198 pp. $2.00. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, Extra Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures, No. 7.)

Giannini, A.—Elementi di grammatica catalana, con brani di letteratura e glossario. *Napoli:* P. Federico e G. Ardia, 1922. viii + 103 pp. L. 6.

Gorostiza, M. E. de.—Contigo pan y cebolla. Edited, with notes, exercises, and vocabulary, by E. McGuire. *Boston:* Ginn and Co., 1922. xx + 120 pp.

Hills, E. C., and Cano, J. — Cuentos y leyendas. With direct-method exercises and vocabulary. By —. *New York:* D. C. Heath and Co., 1922. vii + 172 pp. $1.12.

Mulertt, W.—Anleitung und Hilfsmittel zum Studium des Spanischen. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1922. 44 pp.

Northup, G. T.—Ten Spanish Farces. Introd., notes, vocab. *Boston:* 1922. xxxvii + 229 pp.

Pérez Escrich, E.—Amparo. Edited with introd., ex., vocab. by M. L. Ray and R. A. Bahret. *New York:* American Book Co., 1922. 326 pp. $1.00.

Ruppert y Ujaravi, R.—Shakespeare en España. Traducciones, imitaciones e influencia de las obras de Shakespeare en la literatura española. *Madrid:* Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y seos," 1920. 107 pp.

Schneeberger, A.—Anthologie des po catalans contemporains depuis 1854. *Pa* Povolozki, 1922. 232 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Schuchardt, H.—Zur Kenntnis des kischen von Sara (Labourd). *Berlin:* lag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1 39 pp. M. 10. (Repr. fr. the "Abh lungen der preuss. Akademie der Wi schaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse," Jg. 1922, 1.)

Weigand, G.—Spanische Grammatik Lateinschulen, Universitätskurse und Selbstunterricht. *Halle:* Niemeyer, 1 xii + 212 pp. M. 50.

PORTUGUESE

Bell, A. F. G.—Fernam Lopez. *Lon* H. Milford, 1922. 4sh. (Hispanic N and Monographs. Portuguese Series, I

—— Portuguese Literature. *New Y* Oxford University Press, 1922. 375 $9.45.

Corrêa de Oliveira, A.—Auswahl aus nen Dichtungen mit einer Einleitung einigen Nachdichtungen in deutscher Spr herausgegeben von Luise Ey. *Heidelb* Groos, 1922. xliv + 87 pp. (Neuere po giesische Schriftsteller, IV.)

Dantas, J.—Dramatische Dichtunge Prosa und Versen mit Anmerkungen einem Anhang, enth. portugies. Volksm (Fado) und einem Gedicht, von Luise *Heidelberg:* J. Groos, 1920. viii + 12 (Neuere portugiesische Schriftsteller,

Gil Vicente.—Four plays of —. E from the editio princeps (1562) with t lation and notes, by A. F. G. Bell. facsimiles of the title-pages of the first editions of Vicente's works. *Cambri* University Press, 1921.

Guerra Junqueiro, A. M.—Auswahl seinen Werken mit erklärenden An kungen und einigen deutschen Nach tungen sowie einer Einleitung von Luis *Heidelberg:* J. Groos, 1921. xv + 12 (Neuere portugiesische Schriftsteller,

Jorge, R.—Francisco Rodrigues Estudio biografico e critico. *Coim* Imp. da Universidade, 1922. xi + 474

Martins de Carvalho, F. A.—As edições "Hyssope." Apontamentos bibliograph *Coimbra:* Casa Tipographica, 1922. 6

Trindade Coelho, J. F. de.—Autobiogr und Auswahl aus den belletristischen ken mit erklär. Anmerkungen und ei deutschen Uebersetzungen sowie einer leitung von Luise Ey. *Heidelberg:* J. G 1921. xx + 122 pp. (Neuere portu sche Schriftsteller, I.)

PB
1
M6
v.37

Modern language notes

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY